THE DOCTRINE OF SCHISM

Fully Opened and Applied TO

Gathered Churches.

OCCASIONED

By a Book entituled, *Sacrilegious Diſſertion of the Holy Miniſtery rebuked: and Tolerated Preaching of the Goſpel Vindicated.*

By the Author of Toleration not to be Abuſed by the Presbyterians.

When once Parties are engaged by their Opinions in Anti-Churches and fierce diſputing: The Fleſh and Satan will be working in them againſt all that is Holy, Sweet, and Safe, Baxters Def. p. 57.

London, Printed by *S. G.* and *B. G.* for *James Collins*, and *John Wright* & ſold at the Kings Arms *Ludgate-ſtreet* & at the Globe in *Little Britain*, 1672

Charles Higham Dec. 5, 1921 3/-

TO THE READER,

GOOD READER, *thou art made the* Judge *betwixt us: examine our* arguments, *and observe the* manner, *how we handle them, and* one another *impartially; and then, if thou haſt no* favour, *yet* judge righteouſly, *and I ſubmit.*

Or, if thou haſt any favour, *I entreat thee to beſtow it in reading thoſe few* firſt Chapters, *that are ſpent in* Altercation. *There thou wilt come to* Argument, *and be there as* ſevere *as thou wilt.*

I confeſſe, I have taken the liberty ſometimes to uſe a little pleaſantneſſe, *rather than be* Angry *with a* Severe *Adverſary; that perhaps may incur thy Cenſure: Yet conſider my* provocations *thereunto, and thou wilt either* pardon *me, or condemn me with* pity.

To trouble the READER *with* Perſonal Altercations, *or to uſe any thing like* Drollery, *in a* ſerious *Argument, I like not very well, my Self: And though I know not why my* own heart *ſhould condemn me for either; yet, I fear him, that is* greater than my heart, *and knows* all things; *and judge it ſafeſt to ſay, that, as I never wrote in this manner before, ſo, I hope, I ſhall not be provoked to do ſo again.*

May my Adverſe *Brother have the* ſame mind: *Yea, I hope he is ſo* good *a man, that by his own* better principles (*if not by my Arguments*) *as alſo by* experience (*the groſſeneſs of his Brethrens* Seperations, *being far be-*

beyond what he ſeemed to ſuſpect) *he hath* already *ſuffered himſelf to be ſatisfied; of the evil and danger of our* gathered Churches, *both by* Reaſon *and* Sence.

The GOD of Peace and Truth be with thee, and with his poor Church,

Farewel.

Some ſingle Sermons, and other Diſcourſes touching the preſent Differences in the Church; printed for *James Collins.*

1. *Catholick Charity recommended in a Sermon to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of* London *in order to the abating the animoſities among Chriſtians, that have been occaſioned by differences in Religion by* Joſ. Glanvil, *Rector of* Bathe, *price* 6. d.

2. ΛΟΓΟΥ ΘΡΗΣΚΕΙΑ: *or a ſeaſonable Recommendation and defence of Reaſon in the Affairs of Religion; againſt Infidelity, Scepticiſm, and Phanaticiſmes of all ſorts, by* Joſ. Glanvil. *price* 6 d.

3. *The Chriſtians Victory over Death,*

a Sermon preached at the Funeral of the moſt Honourable George *Duke of* Albemarle, *by* Seth *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum, *price* 6 d.

4. *A Mirour of Chriſtianity, and a Miracle of Charity; or an Exact Narration of the Life and Death of the Lady* Alice *Dutcheſs* Dudley, *by* R. Boreman *D. D. price* 6 d.

5. *The General Aſſembly, or the neceſſity of the receiving the Communion in our publick Congregations: evinced from the nature of the Church, the Word of God, and Presbyterian Principles, in a Sermon by* Francis Fulwood *D. D. pr ce* 6 d.

6. Miſerere Cleri, *A Sermon repreſenting the miſeries of the Clergy, and aſſigning their true cauſes in order to a redreſs, by* Edw. Wetenhal, *BD. price* 6d.

7. *Urim and Thumin; or the Clergies Dignity and Duty, recommended in a Viſitation Sermon, by* Mal. Connant *B. D. price* 6 d.

A Diſcourſe of Toleration, in anſwer to al ate Book entituled A Diſcourſe of the

the Religion of *England*, *price* 6 d.

Indulgence not juſtifyed, being a continuation of the Diſcourſe of Toleration; in Anſwer to the Arguments of a late Book, entituled a Peace-offering, or plea for Indulgence, and to another called the Second Diſcourſe of the Religion *England*, *price* 6 d.

Toleration not to be abuſed, or a ſerious Queſtion ſoberly debated and Reſolved upon Presbyterian Principles, viz. *Whether it be adviſeable, eſpecially for the* Presbyterians, *either in* Conſcience *or* Prudence, *to take advantage from his Majeſties late* Declaration, *to* Deny *or Rebate their* Communion *with our* Parochial *Congregations, and to gather themſelves into diſtinct and* ſeparate *Churches? price* 6 d.

The Judgement of the learned and pious St. Auguſtine; *concerning pœnal Laws againſt Conventicles, and for unity in Religion, delivered in his* 48. *Ep. to* Vincentius, *price* 4 d.

NON-

Non-Conformists NEW-CHURCHES SINFUL.

CHAP. I.

The Introduction. *The* Answerers Title *and the* Impertinency *of it.*

THe *Confident Questionist*, as his *Answerer* calls him, in *this* will *yet* be confident, that, *not many* will not take the task and burthen upon them to *read* the Answer; and that, but *few* of them that read it, will be able to *understand* it: and that few or *none* of that small number, that shall think they understand it, will be able to see the *Consequence* of it: or, lastly, if any shall chance to

be so *lucky*; they must be exceeding *kind*, as well as *wise*, if they can *endure*, without very much patience and some indignation, its *Undertaking*, *Method* and *Manner* of Reasoning: in all which, it pitties me to observe the Author so *like himself*; and so deserving the Title, of the *Episcopal* Patron of *Presbitery*, and the *Independant Catholick* Prelate of Non-Conformity.

The *modest* dress of the *Body* of the Book may answer for it Selfe; but 'tis confest, the *Mouth of it speaks great Swelling Words*: The Title is; *Sacrilegious desertion of the holy Ministry Rebuked, and Tolerated Preaching of the Gospel Vindicated.* What *Conjuring* is here? I am afraid the *Spirits* are disturb'd! *Sacrilegious desertion of the holy Ministry Rebuked!* The *Holy Ministry* Sacrilegiously deserted? What impiety is this? a heinous *Crime* indeed, and worthy a very severe *Rebuke*. But where are the *Criminals?* who are *they* that have wrought this *Abominable* thing? Sure the *Answerer* himself, is in no wise guilty: no, he presently assures you, that he is firmly *resolved* to the contrary; and in this point, I believe, he will as easily answer for the *Questionist*. Who then doth he mean to Rebuke? not the Conformists; they have no liberty to be *Silent* though others have to *Preach*. Besides, if *they* should, especially the

Usur-

Vſurpers among them; I preſume, if *may* might thus be made for the *right Owners*, our *Author* would not be much troubled. Without Controverſy, then, he means his *Brethren* the *Non-Conformiſts*: and have you, indeed, *deſerted* your holy Miniſtry? you are too too blame, and muſt be *Rebuked*: Or have you not already done it? yet, 'tis to be feared, you *may* chance to do it: Or, though at *preſent* you are every where found, rather too *buſy* in the exerciſes of your gifts; and are not unlikely *ſo* to *continue*, yet this *Queſtioniſt* hath ſaid *ſomething*, that in the *Conſequence* of it, ſeems to perſwade you to deſert your Office; or, at leaſt *hereafter* you may poſſibly be urged thereunto, by ſome *ſilly reaſonings*, either of this *Queſtioniſt*, or *ſome other ſuch Pamphleteer*. Now this *Deſertion* of the holy Miniſtry, is a thing of that dangerous *Conſequence*, eſpecially in *You*, and at *ſuch* a time as *this*; that, though it be but in *potentia remotiſſima*, and *onely not* impoſſible to come to paſs, it muſt be *timely* obſerved, by a wiſe *Watchman*; and as if it were *already* in *Act*, it muſt be Rebuked.

For *this Deſertion* of the holy Miniſtry is *Sacrilegious*: there is *ſuch* a thing, in our *Authors* Judgment, however ſome of his Brethren think as *Sacrilege*, under the Goſpel a *Stealing ones Self*, who is *Conſecrated* to

God in the Holy Ministry, from the exercise of it, is a plain *robbing God* himself of his *Service* and consequently, *Sacriledge:* and I fear, this *hint*, especially if practised upon, may bring to our minds and observations too, another kind of *Sacriledge*, that our *Author* was not well aware of: For are there not *some People* Separated, Dedicated, and in a sence, *Consecrated* to *God*; and as justly *Stiled Gods-People*, as the *Preachers*, *Gods-Ministers?* And if *these* should be *stolen* away from God, in his *Churches* and *Ministers*, to whose care he hath committed them, is not *God* himself then *robbed* of them? and ought not *this kind* of Sacriledg also to be feared and *Rebuked?* A worthy *Prebyterian* once thought so and honestly gave the World warning of some *small effects* of it in *these* words: This (said he) *brings* Strife *and* Envyings *among* Ministers, *when others* steal *away their* Members; *and bring Slightings and Contempt upon their Persons and Ministry; and at last, a lamentable Separation, as we see at this day.*

Cawdry's *Independency further proved*, &c. p. 84.

But the *Answerer* must crave your pardon; for indeed the *excessive* Fidelity of his Brethren to their *Preaching-Office*, leaves no room or occasion for his *Rebuking-Office*. Besides, *Sacriledge* has a tender *Edge*, and may chance

chance to *cut* ones fingers, if not warily *handled*. Therefore, though perhaps he had thoughts when he wrote his *Title-page*, to have ſpoken ſomething upon this *Subject*; yet, his Mind it ſeems, is not priviledg'd from *change*; for, at preſent he hath *wav'd* that Argument, and *Sacrilegious deſertion of the holy Miniſtry*, ſhall *eſcape* his Severity till *another opportunity*.

Doubt it not, for if you *turn* over but *one leafe*, you are ſecur'd: he, there as the uſe is, preſents you again with the *Title* of his Book; but there you find nothing of *Sacrilegious deſertion of the holy Miniſtry Rebuked*: no, this *firſt Menace* is now wiſely *omitted*, either by the *Author* or the *Printer*: Wiſely, I ſay, for *Deſertion* of the holy Miniſtry, is ſcarcely *any more* heard of, much leſs *Rebuked*, throughout his *whole* Book. However, let not *his Miniſtry* be deſerted: the *Sermon* may be good, though both *it* and the *Preacher* forget the Text.

CHAP. II.

Of the Answerers discription of Himself: his Abusive Terms touching Non-Conformity, and his mistake of Armagh's Reduction: *those that offer'd it, 1660. were no less Presbyterians: his change of the Question.*

HE worthily observes, the *Questionists* vanity in honouring himself with the *Name*, of a *Lover of Peace and Truth*: and indeed 'twas *saucily* done: the *Answerer* may promote the *Truth* by the liberty of *Errours*; and seek for *Peace* by *pleading* for, if not practising *Divisions*: but who are you, *Sir Confident*, that *you*, should so much as *pretend* to the *love* of either.

But, pray Mr. *Answerer* what is your Name? there are many that say they *know* you by your *Reason* and *Passion*, and by your *Words* and *Works*; but pray you let me know your *Name*. You *have told* me already; and I find it at *large* in your *Title Page*, attended *before*, with *two* great *Titles* to your Book, little to the purpose but for Ceremony: and follow'ed *after* with the train of *three* pompous places of *Scripture*, to fill up the Page.

One that is Consecrated to the sacred Ministry, and is resolved not to be a wilful deserter of

of it, in truſt that any Undertakers can juſtifie him for ſuch Deſertion at the Judgment of God; till he know better how thoſe can come off themſelves, who are unfaithful Paſtors, or unjuſt Silencers of others.

And, is *this* your Name indeed? Certainly his *Grace* at *Lambeth* hath ſcarce a greater. Here is *Conſecration, Reſolution, Condemnation*, againſt the *unfaithful* of *Paſtors*, and the *Injuſtice* of the *King* and *Parliament* for Silencing *better*: But, as the *Lion* ſometimes, is not ſo fierce as he is *Painted*; ſo, I hope this is no *Scripture Name*, that indicates the *Nature* of the Perſon. But, ſo ſhall the *Man be honored*, that loves not *Himſelf*, or *Party*, above *Truth* and *Peace*.

Reader, here is nothing but *meekneſs* and gentleneſs and humility worthy of the *Author*, to be *underſtood*: however, the expreſſions found a little *otherwiſe*, 'tis the *Queſtioniſt* only is *Confident* and *unintelligible*, though one would think at the *firſt* hearing, that this long Name is *Monſtrum, Horrendum*, and I cannot but add, *Ingens, cui lumen Ademptum.*

Now what dare not the Man of *this great Name, ſay* or *do?* he dare *ſay*, the *Conformiſts* are the *Schiſmaticks*; and that many of them, that now hold the places, that were formerly *Non-conformiſts*, are *Uſurpers*; and that it

is *faithfulness to the King* to disown such kind of *Usurpers*, though establish'd in their *Places* and *Power* by the *Laws* of the Land. p. 39.

He dare say 'tis *Impudence* and *Ignorance* of the *present State of England* to call those *Presbyterians* that did at the *Kings Return* offer Arch-Bishop *Ushers Form of Episcopal Government*, as he calls it, for Concord: though Mr. *Calamy* was one of that Number, whose Name is found in *Smectimnuus*.

He dare call that book a *Form of Episcopal Government*, contrary to the Express *Title* of it, which is a *Reduction of Episcopacy to the Forme of Synodical Government*. Which, as Dr. *Bernard* well observes, was only an expedient for the *present Necessity*, occasioned by the *Tempestuous violence* of that time; as an Accomodation, by way of prevention of a *Total Shipwrack*, threatned by the Adversaries of *Episcopacy*, as appears sufficiently by the *Title* of it.

Clavi Trabales. p. 54.

It is, therefore *ingeniously* argued by our *Author*, those that are called *Presbyterians* did desire that *Episcopacy* might be reduced to the forme of *Synodical Government*, therefore they are no *Presbyterians*, they are not for *Synodical Government*.

The *plain truth* is, that *Reduction* propo-

seth

ſeth a way for *Union* and Conſolidation of the *two* Governments; but *that*, *ſuch* a Union, as ſhould contain *both*, without the loſs of *either*; and leaſt of all, as the neceſſity of that time required, of the *Presbyterian*: And conſequently, thoſe, that would ſubmit unto that *Reduction*, might ſtill be *Presbyterians* both in *Name* and *Thing*, however it fared with *Epiſcopacy*.

For, all men are not bound to *ſubſcribe* or *ſwear* unto the *definition* of a *Presbyterian*, which our *Anſwerer* impoſeth upon the World: or to believe, that the *Divine Right of the Ruling Elder Unordained is eſſential to the Presbyterial Government*; (p. 5.) for the *Government* may be *Synodical* without it. And I need not give him Inſtances, that *that kind* of Government was endeavoured to be *Erected*, in the ſeveral parts of the Kingdome, by the Agreement of ſeveral *Eminent* Miniſters of *that way*, that yet denied the *Jure divino* of meer *Ruling-Elders*; and admitted them only as *Prudential*: and I doubt not he very well knows it to be ſo.

But, as to that *Application* made in 1660. which he ſpeaks of; 'tis too well known, that in *effect* it rather propoſed for the *Presbyterial*, than for the *Epiſcopal* Government; and had it taken, the *Biſhop*, ſhould have had left him little more than the *Name*; who was rather,

rather, to have been a *Moderator*, or Chairman *durante vitâ*, than a *Bishop*, in a common acceptation: or if a *Bishop*, such a one, as might well enough have consisted with *Synodical* Government, or the design had been lost. But what need any more be said? the *Proposers* would not allow him a *Negative* voice, and consequently, the *Synod* or *Presbytery* should have *Govern'd*, either *with* or *without* his Consent: and is not this a fair *Apology*, *twice* offered, by our *Answerer*; that therefore, because they would have Admitted the *Reduction* of *Episcopacy* to their own *Presbyterial* Government, they are no *Presbyterians*.

Again; It is nothing for him to say, that the *Reasonings* of the *Questionist*, are *weak* and *silly* over and over: that they are *Confident to Admiration*: full of *Noise* and *Nonsence*, *Confused* and *Unintelligible*, and *Schismatical* too. (*p.*29.) These are his *soft* and *gentle* Strokes upon one that deserves to be called *Names*, that would foul *Paper*, as he intimates more than once, as an Argument of his unwillingness to offend his *Reader* and *Himself*; though he have no *foul mouth*.

But he dare venture farther and say; that Mr. *Fulwoods*, Mr. *Stilemans* and Mr. *Hinckleys* Books for *Conformity* are *such Toyes*—— of *factious Disputers*. He dare say; *that his own flesh disputeth in him more Cunningly, than all*

all the Durells, Fulwoods and *Stilemans* in *England*; and yet in *one* thing, methinks, his *ſpirit* fails him, and he appears too much unlike the valiant *Hero* I ever took him for. He, in *one* place, ſaith, *p.*32. *Had he had leave to confute the* Silly *Reaſonings of Mr.* Fulwood *and other ſuch* Pamphleteers, *he had long ago done ſtrange things.* And in *another*, *p.*39. he would have me *procure* him leave to *give his Reaſons of Non Conformity.* Alas, good man! that he ſhould want *Leave* to do ſuch *brave* things; that he ſhould want *Will* or *Zeal* to do them *without* leave. He ſaith, *p.*31. *that I knew that he muſt not give his Reaſons againſt Conformity.* But who gave him *leave* to *Preach* before the *Indulgence?* who gave him *leave* to *Print this* Anſwer? Or is it *poſſible* to ſpeak *bolder* things againſt *Conformity* if he had *leave* to do it, than he *hath* done *here?* The *Conformiſts* are *Uſurpers* and *Schiſmaticks:* thoſe that Silenced the *Non-Conformiſts* are *Unjuſt*, *Cruel* and *Sacrilegious*: *Conformity is guilty of Perfidiouſneſs, Perjury and Perſecution*: *Conformiſts are Proud, and contend who ſhall be Greateſt*; *and Covenant never in certain points to obey Chriſt againſt the World and the Fleſh.* as he humbly inſinuates, *p.*74.

But in Earneſt, can he that *lets flie* at this rate, perſwade us, that it is only want of *leave*, that hath hindered his *Anſwering* the Books

Books aforesaid? Can he perswade us, that his *Obedience* to *Man*, can warrant his *omission* of so great a *Charity*, as his effectual endeavor to *rescue Conformists* from these desparate enormities? or can he think so honorably of our *Governours*, as to fear that his *strong Reasons* would more *offend* and *provoke* them, if given without their *Licence*, than *these* hard uncharitable, *unconscionable* insinuations, and unjust *accusations*, against *themselves*, as well as *us*.

Away then with this *childish passion* of *fear*, 'tis altogether unbecoming our *Goliah*, that *defies* the whole *Army* of *Israel*. You have Troops of *Propositions* always at Command, and so many Yokes of *Distinctions*, that you doubtless are able to make *good* what ever you have said, be it never so bad, if you *durst*, or had *leave*. But what need of *Leave*? or why should you *Fear*? what *quidlibet* or *quodlibet* can stand before you? *p.* 30. You are the Man of *Art*, that can *doe* and *undoe*, *prove* and *disprove* the *same* thing; or else, many of your *Friends* as well as *Enemies* have done you wrong.

I am *one* of his *Friends*, and I dare affirm of him, to his deserved *honour*; that he never yet wanted *Matter* of Argument, against the *Cause*, or of *Rebuke* against the *Person* of any Man that ever opposed him. He hath

one

one very *ſtrange* and *wonderful* peice of *Artifice*; that, be the *Controverſie* what it will, he can make his *Adverſary* differ with him, about the Exiſtence of a *God* and *Chriſt*, an *Heaven* and *Hell*; that he may take occaſion to tell the World, that *ſome Teachers need theſe plain Admonitions*. p.26.

But this ſubtil *Anſwerer*, hath a *more powerful Stratagem*, never to be eſcaped; for he can make his *Adverſary* ſay any thing, that he, himſelf thinks he can *moſt eaſily* oppoſe; or if he cannot make *him* ſay it, he can *affirm* and *prove* he ſaith it; and then, *thunder* out a Volume againſt *him* for *ſaying ſo*.

We have a very Notable Inſtance of his Skill *this way* in our hands. If the *Queſtioniſt* dare ſay, that *Toleration ought not to be abuſed* by *Presbyterians*, in *gathering themſelves into diſtinct Churches* in oppoſition to the *Parochial*, he will moſt *ſtrenuouſly* and *pertinently* confute him, with a *Book*, called by the *hard Name* above mentioned, *Sacrilegious deſertion of the holy Miniſtry Rebuked; and Tolerated Preaching of the Goſpel Vindicated*.

And if it be too palpable, that *that Author* ſaid nothing for the *Sacrilegious deſertion of the holy Miniſtry* fit to be *Rebuked*, he can, as we before obſerved, quickly deſert that *part* of his undertaking; but yet proceed to write his *Book* in the *Vindication of Tolerated Preaching*;

ing; and perſwade the World, with no mean Confidence, that the *ſcope* of the *Book* he pretends to Anſwer, is directly againſt ſuch *Tolerated Preaching*. Yea, in the very *beginning* of his Book, *p.*2. And in another *Character*, on purpoſe to have the *Reader* note it; he *expreſly* affirms; that he finds-- the *Queſtioniſt* hath the *Face* (though he hath not the *mouth* that ſpoke it, or the *hand* that wrote it) yet he hath the *face to exhort them to deſert their Office*. But with how much *Ingenuity* and *Juſtice*, *God* and his own *Conſcience* muſt needs know *already*; and he muſt give me leave to let the *World* know it alſo, in the *Chapter* following.

CHAP. III.

I did not exhort them to deſert their Office as he Affirmeth. His manner of Cenſuring leſs *Errors. About Toleration. The Authors* kindneſs *to Non-Conformiſts.*

SIR, I will take leave to ſay; you may bleſs your ſelf, that you have engaged an *Adverſary* that is a *Friend*; and hath neither *Wit* nor *Will* to *practice* upon you, as *ſome* have done upon *leſs* Provocation.

That you might have *ground* to run out upon

upon me, as an Enemy to *Tolerated Preaching*; you expreſly affirme, *p.*2. that you *find I exhort you to deſert your Office*: and that it ſeemeth, *p.*60. that acknowledging us *true Churches*, will not ſatisfie us, without What? *Actual hearing us.* We would *ſtroke you into ſilence and the neglect of your Office. p.*25. You ask, *p.* 58, 59. whether it be *Sin in you to Preach*; and labour much, in the proof of the *Neceſſity* of your Preaching. And you intimate, that if the *Non Conformiſts* ſhould not Preach, they ſhould be *Idle, Cruel, Sacrilegious* and *Perfidious:* as are your words, *p.*27, 28.

Now, Sir, in my *ſillie* way of reaſoning, I muſt demand, whether you do *indeed* find, *thoſe words*, for which you perſecute me, throughout *your* Book, in *my Book*, or not.

If you ſhall ſay, you do *find thoſe words*, or words to *that effect*; I am not *ſatisfied*, unleſs you tell me *where*: for I ſolemnly proteſt, *I know not.* Why did you not *name* the *page*, where they were to be found, as in *other* caſes you *generally* do? eſpecially, *this* being the *main matter* of offence to you; that *provoked* you to ſo much *ſeverity throughout* your Book againſt me; for you *begin* your Book to this purpoſe: that if it had been all my endeavour that the *Toleration ſhould not be abuſed*, you ſhould *earneſtly have ſeconded me*: but when you *found* that *I had the face to exhort*

hort you to desert your Office, &c. that I *come to you in Gods Name, to charge you to forbear His work*: then, you say, *your Conscience had you help to save the weaker sort that need, from such Pernicious Fallacies*

Sir, I do with all earnestness, and yet *meekness*, let you know; that I expect you should make *good* your *charge*: shew me *these words*, or words that carry the *same sence*, in any place of my book, or *confess* you have wronged me, and I am *satisfied*.

But yet, *turn the Tables*, and ask your self seriously, what *lashes you* would have censured *me* worthy, should I have dealt *so* with *you*. Take an *Instance* of your *Spirit* and *Charity*, upon a far *less* occasion given you, as you conceive, in my Book; when, upon a *Misinformation* at most, I only Asked a *Question*, in a matter of no great moment, *viz. Whether the Presbyterians did not heretofore refuse the Comprehension, because they could not have it without a general Toleration?* See, how you *flie* upon me, with all *fury*, and say, *p.* 62, 63, 64. *This hath no bounds, and it grieveth me to read it. O Posterity! How will you know what to believe? you should not by Question, have vented such a falshood.* And yet, notwithstanding all this vehemence, in the next *pages*, you seem your self to intimate, in my weak opinion, *grounds sufficient* for the *Rumour*

mour and *Suſpition*, and conſequently the *Queſtion*: But I am not obſtinate in my own *Defence*, leaving my *Queſtion* and your *Cenſure* upon it, with your Diſcourſe and *Conceſſion* about it, to the mercy of the *Reader*, who will *judge* betwixt us, whether we will or not.

However, *thanks be to God*, (though by your *charging* me to have written things, that I have not written, contrary to plain *Truth* and *Juſtice*, you have given me far greater provocation) yet, I ſay, thanks be to God, you have not *tempted* me to turn your *own words* upon you, and to ſay *to you*, as you do *to me*, [*Repent of ſuch Calumnies*, and *ſtudy not to aggravate your fault by excuſes --- we lament his want of common ſence or modeſty--- what dealing is to be expected from ſuch men---* with *what forehead---* is *this Humility or miniſterial Fidelity*, to *begin* your Book with ſo *direct* an untruth, and to ſtand to it, and repeat it *ſo often* in the face of the World?

Lord! what have I ever *ſaid* or *done* in order to the *ſilencing* of *Non-conformiſts*, as you *frequently* ſeem to charge me? yea, what have I *not* done or ſaid, as I was able and had any opportunity, that their *mouths* might be *opened*? the World knows my ſeveral *publick* endeavors to that purpoſe: I do not ſay

my *silly Arguments*, (as you meekely call them) but, perhaps, my *Mediation* (as some persons will more ingeniously acknowledge) for the peaceable Non-conformists, from the Kings Return to the day of the Indulgence, and since too, hath not been altogether ineffectual, and perhaps considering all that hath been too much, and my Superiors have been very candid if they have not thought it troublesome.

I must take the boldness to add, that were I *conscious* to my self, that any thing I ever *said* or *did*, hath been so great a *Remora* in the way of accommodation betwixt nonconformity and the Church of *England*, as the *boisterous reasonings* and *desires* of some men, I fear I should carry it with *sorrow to my grave*: If I *err* in this *censure*, I beg the pardon both of *God* and *them*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

'Tis not fair to charge Conſequences for Doctrines; much leſs to ſay, the Conſequence is aſſerted; let the Anſwerer be Judge. Mr. Baxter *was not abuſed.*

I Obſerved, that you charged me *untruly* with diſſwading you to *deſert your Office*, and have cauſe to fear, you will *make excuſes* your ſelf, although you will not *allow* it in *others*: and I cannot but expect you will ſay *thus*, or to *this effect*; That though I do not aſſert in *plain* terms, or in words that will admit or *bear* that *ſence*, yet the *conſequence* of my Diſcourſe, is to *take* you *off* from *Preaching*, while I would diſſwade you from *Gathering-Churches*.

For I find, after I have read *long* in your Book, and even towards the *latter end* of it, you have patience thus far to *explain* your ſelf. Becauſe, ſay you, *p.* 57. I would prove your *ſeparation* ſinful, I would therefore prove your *preaching* ſinful. Again, *p.* 59. if *God* ſay, *preach*, and the *Law* ſay, *preach not in Temples*; we may conclude, we *muſt* preach *out of the Temples*. And becauſe I ſpeak againſt *erecting Separated Congregations* to your ſelves, you ſay, *p.* 70. I mean *it is ſin in you to exerciſe your Miniſtery*: *i. e.* you

mean, this is the *consequence* of what I say against your *separation*: For, can we *preach*, as you add, without *Auditors*? and can these *Auditors* be no *Congregation*?

Thus you do, (pardon me if) I think, not very *accurately mend* the matter, nor very *intelligibly explain* your meaning. But, I remember, you told me, *p* 33. the *Presbyterians do not love confusion*: And also *p*. 4. that *you* are no *Presbyterian*.

But, my Brother, I must needs mind you, that whether *this* consequence be *strong* or not, I am sure the *excuse* is *weak*, and unwarrantable by the Laws of all sober disputation.

1. For admit the consequence to be *fair* and *just*, your *dealing* with me is *neither*, when you charge me with an *assertion* which only follows, or may be drawn from my *proposition*. It is not allowable to say the *consequent* of my opinion is *my opinion*, and that I hold it: much less hath it any *colour* of *candor* or justice, to say, I *assert* it, and *maintain* it. How then can you answer me, or give me *satisfaction*, for saying, *first*, that that which *your self* hath argued from my proposition, is *my proposition*; and then *write a book* against *me* for it.

This is not too like a *favorable* Disputant, were the consequence *most obvious* and *immediate*;

mediate; whereas in the *case* in hand, 'tis *neither so*, nor *so*; but contrarily, very *doubtful*, obscure, and *remote*, *your self* being Judge.

The *Question* here is, Whether I cannot write against *gathering Churches* out of our Churches, and yet not exhort you to *desert your Ministery?* You hold it in the *Negative*. Now, to *fill* up the *vacances* of your former *uneven* Argument, to make it good, there is need of the skill of a learned *Propositionist* to work *thus*.

You *must preach*; you may *not* preach in the *Temples*, therefore you must preach *somewhere else*: Here's the *place* provided, but where are the *People?* Let's try again, if you *must* preach, you must have *people* to hear you: there are *none* to be had, but such as belong to *our Churches*; therefore you must *gather Churches* out of our Churches; therefore I that exhort you not to *gather Churches* out of our Churches, exhort you to *desert your Office* and Ministery; and therefore, by *defending* your *Office*, you answer my *Book* of Toleration not to be *abused*, by *gathering Churches out of Churches*.

Thus *strangers* greet, and both ends are at length brought together; but their *firm* friendship depends upon the strength of this *golden Chain*, or *Rope* of *Sand*, which may come to be tried *anon*.

In the mean time let us change *the Scene*, and then make judgement of *this way* of arguing, *your self*.

Suppose I should write a Book, and intitle it, *Sedition Rebuked*; and call this a *Reply* to your *Answer*: taking it for *granted*, that every one would *see* the *consequence* as well as my self; and thereupon, at *every turn*, I should charge you with the *Defence* of *Sedition*, and labor against you to prove *Sedition a sin*; *meaning* all this while, (though never observing any *such* thing, when I *purposely* and largely, with about *threescore Propositions* endeavor *de industria* to *state* the *Question*) that *Sedition* lies at the *bottom*, and in the *consequence* and tail of your Discourse thus; in many *places* you intimate, the *Priest* is *intollerable*; and there, whether the People will endeavor *regularly* to remove him or not, you exhort them to *disown* and *forsake* him, and the *place* by *Law appointed* for Publick Worship, and to gather themselves into *another* Church, under *another* (Non-conforming) *Minister*: This is to exhort the *People* to begin a *publick Reformation* without their *Governors*; this is *Sedition*, or the *way* to *Sedition*, to say no *worse*; and this will therefore *justifie* my *manner* of writing against you, and my frequent *charging sedition*, and the *defence* of *sedition* upon you.

Pray

Pray be ingenuous, how would *you* like this *way* of arguing? Whether the conſequence be *true* or *falſe*, you will not ſay this is fair dealing; you would ſay you were highly injured, I am ſure you would.

And now I am come ſo near it, I will preſent you with ſuch an *inſtance* in *your Book*, that will to the purpoſe convince you at once, both of your *Ingenuity* in *this way* of arguing, and of the *cenſure* you give me, upon a falſe *ſuppoſition*, that I had *abuſed* my worthy Friend Dr. *Baxter*, in *affirming*, that he had ſaid *ſomething* that he *never* ſaid. 'Tis thus:

You tell me, *p.* 48. that *Baxter* (as you *familiarly* call him) *taketh himſelf to be abuſed by my Allegations, & provoketh me to cite any of his words which are againſt Non-conformiſts preaching as they have opportunity*; and ſomewhat *ſharply* mind me, that *he* and Mr. *Ball underſtand themſelves better then I do them.*

Now, *who* would not *hence conclude*, that I had ſaid, that that *reverend Perſon* had written againſt *Non conformiſts preaching, as they have opportunity.* But *where* have I ſaid ſo, or any thing to that *purpoſe?* I know your *civility* and *veracity* will engage you to *ſhew it*; therefore you *refer* your Reader to *p* 16. of *my Book:* There, indeed, I find the *place* which you mean, but not one tittle of

the *words* or *thing* you *say*. My words there are these; *Particularly the Arguments of* Mr. Baxter *and* Mr. Crofton, *for communion with our Parochial Congregations are still the same, and ought to be answered, before you begin your work of Separation, and think of building new any Synagogues.*

But is *this* to say, *that* Mr. Baxter *hath written against Non-conformists preaching as they have opportunity?* Yet if Mr. *Baxter* hath writ *nothing* against Non-Conformists Preaching, which I *never said*; Mr. *Baxter* hath written Arguments for *Communion* with *our Parochial Congregations*, which I *did say*, and *still* maintain; and neither Mr. *Baxter* no *your self* will deny it, except in *Drollery*.

Cure of Church-Divisions, and Defence of against *Bagshaw*.

And pray tell me, what reason hath that *learned* and *peaceable* man to hold himself *abused* by me, for *commending* his Arguments, to be considered by *such* as he intended them for? did he not *publish* them that they might be *considered?* or hath he chang'd his *mind*, and thinks them *now inconsiderable* himself? or more *unseasonable* now, then *when* he wrote them?

I think worthily of that *reverend* Author, but, Sir, what *you* can say for *your self*, I know not: You ought, if I might be Judge,

first

firſt ſatisfie the World that I have *not abuſed* Mr. *Baxter*; and *then*, to acknowledge the Abuſe you have put upon *your ſelf* and Mr. *Baxter*, upon *me* and the *Reader*, and the *plain truth*.

If the *cenſure* ſeem *rigorous*, judge your ſelf, and *mitigate* it, if you find cauſe; but conſider, that you your ſelf intimate, that Mr. Baxter *never wrote any* thing againſt *their* preaching; and yet *you* know, that he hath written much, and that lately too, for *communion with our Parochial Congregations*: the thing I affirmed. But *this way* of Reaſoning, and undue accuſation, is ſo familiar a thing in the Book before me, that, I fear, I have *abuſed* my Readers *ſtomach*, by ſtaying himſelf ſo long upon *one* or *two* particulars of ſo *groſs* a nature.

I confeſs, it is as *lawful* as 'tis uſual, to *confute* a propoſition from the ill *conſequences* and inconveniences of it; but this is *one thing*: and to *ſet up* the ill *conſequence* as the *Doctrine* of the Adverſary, and under that *form* to diſpute and *write a Book* againſt it, eſpecially without ſhewing the *neceſſity*, if not the *obviouſneſs* and *immediateneſs* of ſuch conſequence, in the *ſtating* of the Queſtion; all which you very skilfully think not fit to do: *this* I am bold to ſay, is *another thing*; and *ſuch* a thing as ought never to plead *In-*

dulgence

dulgence or Toleration, especially in a *grave* and *grown*, and *practised* Disputant.

However, *two* things ought always to be remembred, that *incommodum non solvit Argumentum*; and if any *good* may come out of *evil*, yet we must not *do evil that such good may come*. 'Tis a *good thing* for any one to *provide* for his *Family*; yet I may not *steal* that I may provide for my *Family*: nor thus argue, I *must provide* for my Family, I cannot do it *except I steal*; therefore I *must steal*, or thus I *must preach*; I cannot preach but I must *gather a Church* out of my *Neighbors* Congregation; therefore I *must gather a Church*, &c. though I before observed, there are *some* that call that *stealing*; and that not only from my *Neighbor*, but *God* himself.

But more of this *anon*; in the mean time let it only remembred, that if you may not preach in the *Temples*, as you acknowledg; and if you cannot preach in *other places*, as you more then intimate, without *gathering Churches*, &c. and if this be found stealing and unlawful, and therefore it follow, that *without conforming* you cannot *lawfully* exercise your gift of preaching, I cannot help it.

However, at *present*, I have a mind to *relieve* you, by doing you the kindness to *question the consequence* of your Argument; and

and that I may alſo relieve the *Reader*, and give him ſpace to *breathe* a little, this ſhall be the matter of *another Chapter*.

CHAP. V.

The conſequence of deſerting their Office from their not gathering, diſproved as not good *either according to the Authors Principles, or the Anſwerers, or the nature of thing it ſelf.*

I Hope, by this time, you perceive you have not dealt like a very *fair* Diſputant, in *framing a propoſition* your ſelf, and then *publiſhing* it to the World as *mine*, and as *aſſerted* and *defended* by my *Book*; and accordingly laboring to *demoliſh* it in the deſign and ſcope of your *Anſwer*, although *that* propoſition had been the *neceſſary*, *plain*, and *immediate* conſequence of what I had *affirmed* or *denied*.

But what ſhall I ſay if it indeed appear *otherwiſe*, and if that which you *impoſe* upon me, and ſo zealouſly *oppoſe* in me; be not, in *any* ſenſe, the *conſequence* of what I had *ſaid*, either *immediately* or *remotely*, *plainly* or *obſcurely*, or *any* way *neceſſarily*. And that though I do *aſſert*, that it is *unlawful for you*

to

to gather new Churches, it will *not follow*, either from *my principles*, or from the *nature* and truth of the thing, or from *your own* principles, that I muſt *needs* hold it to be *unlawful* for you to *exerciſe* your Miniſtery; or would *perſwade* you to *deſert your Office*, let *each* be examined.

1. To make your charge againſt me *any way tolerable*, you ſhould make it appear at leaſt, from *my principles*, which is not poſſible for you to do: for, though I judge it *unlawful* for you to *gather new Churches* to preach unto, I hold it *equally unlawful* for you to *deſert your Office*: 'Tis my plain opinion, you ought *rather* then *either* of theſe, to attend upon the Miniſtery of the *Temples*; and in order thereunto to *conform*: and be it known unto you, if you knew it not *before*, that I am much of Mr. *Fulwood*'s mind, who in *three* Books, publiſhed by him to that purpoſe, hath endeavored to *convince* you, that *this is his judgement*, and *that your duty*.

Now, unleſs an endeavor to perſwade you *not* to deſert your Office, be to exhort you to *deſert your Office*; yea, unleſs I had declared, that I believe there is *no better*, or no *other* way, for you to *ſerve* your *Miniſtery*, then by *gathering Churches*, how can you *affirm* with *honour to your wit and ingenuity*, p. 57. that by diſſwading you from the

the *latter*, I exhort to desert the *former*.

2. Neither doth it follow from the *nature* and truth of the thing; there is no such *indissoluble* connexion betwixt *these* two Propositions, that from my asserting *one* of them, you should boldly charge me with the *other*.

I do say, you *may not gather Churches*; I do not *therefore* say, you may not preach: or, if I did say that *in statu quo* you may not preach; I do not say, you may not *change* your state, as before, and *then* preach; I do not say, the King may not *open the door* of the *Temple* to you, that you might preach *there*; or if I had said *all* this, yet I had not said, you should desert your Office; for *not* to *preach* is *one thing*, and to *desert* your Office is *another*.

For no man may say, that a Minister *deserts* his Office, who living in a place of *Christian Government*, and hath no *title*, but sincerely *desires* it, though he do *actually* preach, without publick *licence*, or the *leave* of a particular Pastor; and he that acknowledgeth any thing of *Government*, cannot be sober and believe that his *Office* obligeth him to go into *Houses* for want of a *Temple*; and there endeavor to *draw* the people from the *publick* worship, without the *leave* of their faithful Pastor; and that too, just at the *times appointed*

appointed for the *publick* worſhip, as the *cuſtome* generally is, notwithſtanding your *example* and *Edicts* to the contrary, and this, forſooth, becauſe he *muſt preach*.

Yea, once more, admit that a *lawfully ordained* Miniſter rightfully *inducted* into his cure, ſhould be *ſuſpended*, juſtly or unjuſtly, by a lawful *Authority*; (and I think this may venture to comprehend ſomething of our preſent caſe:) will any *rule* of good *Policy*, or regular *Reaſon*, allow *this Miniſter* to preach within the *bounds* of that Authority that *ſilenc'd* him, before ſuch Authority is *ſatisfied*, either for the *offence*, or of the *innocency* of the *Perſon*, and the *unwarrantableneſs* of the *ſentence*.

Neither can I ſee (pardon my dulneſs) how any *Government* can be *ſecured* from the danger of General Confuſion, that ſhall ſuffer *this Principle* [*we muſt preach*] to bear it down. I wiſh heartily I may be found *miſtaken* in this at *laſt*; however, I am ſure, if perſons *thus ſuſpended* ſhall (during their ſuſpenſion) *forbear* to preach, at leaſt till the *innocency* of their Cauſe, and the unjuſtneſs of their *ſilencing* be very clear and undoubted, *generally* to perſons *unconcerned*, they do not by their *obedience* and *unvoluntary* ſilence *deſert their Office*, though they be yet in the *poſſeſſion* of their *Cures*: their

non-

non-actual preaching in obedience to Authority, deſerves a better *name* then a *ſacrilegious deſertion of the Holy Miniſtery*; much leſs if Miniſters have *no Cures* of their own, may they be charged with *deſerting* their Office, becauſe they *gather* not our people from our *Temple-worſhip*, that they may have *Auditors* to preach unto, though *without* ſo doing they *could not* preach.

3. Let us now, laſtly, try the ſtrength of *this* conſequence by *your own* principle diſcovered to us by your *conceſſions* and *purpoſes* in your Book; but more eſpecially, in your *advice* given to the *Non-conformiſts*.

In *p.* 92. you ſay, In *Pariſhes where all may hear the Pariſh-Miniſter, I would not have you* (Non-conformiſts) *without neceſſity preach at the ſame hour of the day, but at ſome middle time, that you may not ſeem to vie with him for Auditors, nor to draw the People from him; but let them go with you to hear him, and after come and hear you.* I do acknowledge that in other places, though you omit it here, you provide that the Miniſter of the Pariſh be *faithful, truly endeavoring the ſalvation of his flock.*

I am not here to urge, or inſiſt upon the *inconveniencies* of *ſuch a practice*; and if the *Non-conformiſt* be an humble, diſcreet, and good man, for my part I ſhould not much

fear

fear them; but my buſineſs is to collect from this Advice of yours, that *you* your ſelf can hardly believe, that *deſerting your Office*, doth *neceſſarily* follow the *not gathering of Churches*; and that not only in *mine*, but in the *common* and uſual underſtanding of the *terms*.

For thus, as you well obſerve, the *Non-conformiſt* would but hold a *Chappel meeting* under, and be *ſubſervient* in his work to the *Pariſh-Miniſter*; and *ſuch* preaching would in no ordinary conſtruction be termed *Schiſm*, or a *gathering a Church* out of, or *diſtinct*, much leſs in *oppoſition* to the *Pariſh-Church*, but a *furtherance*, if well managed, to the *common intereſt* and concern of it; as the office of a *School maſter* in *Catechiſing* the yonger ſort upon the *week days*.

And could we find that *this* cauſe had been indeed taken upon the *foreſaid conditions*, as *you adviſe*, we ſhould not have thought we had not had much reaſon to endeavour to prevent the *Abuſe* of *Toleration* by the *Preſbyterians*, or to complain as we do.

But 'tis ſad to obſerve *their practice quite contrary*, generally ſo far as we can learn, and particularly in the populous *City* where I dwell, that are moſt *conveniently* ordered into *Pariſhes*, and the beſt provided of *faithful* Miniſters, for to *ſuch* places the *Non conformiſts*

formists generally reſort, and ſet up their meetings in direct oppoſition to the *Parochial* Churches, at the *ſame time* with the publick Worſhip; not endeavoring, in the leaſt, any communion with it, or the Pariſh-Miniſter; but to as much diſcouragement of him as poſſibly they can.

And in *thoſe* other places, where they have ſet up their *Meetings*, (there are but few that think it convenient to venture in the Country Pariſhes) they take the *ſame* courſe, without any regard to the diſtinction of *faithful* and *unfaithful* Miniſters; and this is the thing we call *Schiſm* and ſinful ſeparation, and unlawful gathering of Churches out of Churches, and cannot ſee how you can believe that the *neceſſity* of your Office can juſtifie ſuch *dividing* practices, who ſeem to deteſt them.

Yea, if ſuch as bear the *name* and *licence* of *Presbyterian*-Miniſters, would follow *your advice*, and only gather *temporary* Aſſemblies (waiting for a *fixed* better ſtate, as you ſpeak) in *London*, and in ſome *Country* Pariſhes, where the Miniſters are *intollerable*, till they are better provided for, though perhaps we juſtly differ from you about the *number* of *intollerable* Miniſters, and muſt in *reaſon* judge, that your *firſt* endeavors ſhould try to have ſuch Miniſters remov'd;

yet, I conceive, we ſhould not have ſo *great* cauſe of lamentation, as now is too too notoriouſly given us, by the unreaſonable *cauſers* of our *Diviſions*.

Sir, give me leave to ſay and believe, upon the obſervation of the *peaceable Principles*, I find now and then *hinted*, even in the midſt of your *heat* againſt me, in your Book, that did you *rightly* apprehend how *matters are carried* by theſe *Church-gatherers* for the dividing, diſſipating, and as much as in them lies, deſtroying our *Parochial Churches*, you would return to your *firſt thoughts*, and no longer *oppoſe*, but *ſecond* me.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The Queſtion is firſt ſtated, not unintelligible: Now again clear'd and free'd from his Exceptions.

YOu now perceive that the *main* of your Book is anſwered, by *demonſtrating* how little it is to the purpoſe, to ſay no worſe: and thus you ſee, what trouble you put me to, to anſwer Nothing. *p.*40.

But Soft, Sir, What if enough be found beſides, and, *on the by*, to Confute you? perhaps, there is nothing in *your Book*, at leaſt, your *Anſwerer* might think ſo, *ſufficient* to provoke *ſo great* a Man, to ſet his *wit* directly againſt you. If it be ſo, I *accept* his *mercy*; for then, the *Match* being the *more equal*, I do the better conceive a *Confidence* to *defend* my ſelf: and, at *laſt*, to the *point*.

In the *State* of my Queſtion, I firſt ſuppoſed, that the *Presbyterians would not joyn with the Independents*: but, therein, my *Anſwerer* intimates, *p.* 28. I was miſtaken; for it is an Article of his *Faith* (ſo far as faith is concerned in the point) that the *Presbyterians will joyn with* (their *now* friends) *the Independents*, not as a *Sect*, &c. Yea, *p.*29. that they *will joyn with the* Sect (as he is pleaſed to ho-

nour us) *of the Diocesan Prelatists*, in the *Parish Churches* also. O the Charity of *Presbyterians!* and the length of their *Armes*, that can embrace persons at *so great* a distance! But pray, Sir, what do you mean, by *joyning* with the *Independents?* Will you, indeed, joyn with them in their *Congregations?* If this be not your meaning, you are again upon the point of *little to the purpose*. But if it be, and yet you will joyn with them as a *Sect*, your *Judgment* is as *deep*, as your *affection* is *broad*.

But to proceed, upon that mistake, my Question was shortned to *this* purpose; Whether the *Presbyterians*, as things now stand, ought in *Conscience* or *Prudence*, to Set up for *Themselves*, or to *Worship God with the rest of their Neighbours*, in their several, proper *Parochial-Congregations?*

What I meant by their *Setting up* for themselves, was plained in the very *Question*, as was *just before* proposed: *viz. A refusing our Communion and a gathering themselves into distinct and separate Churches.*

Now, rather, than I will run in a *Maze*, or venture my self in an *Ocean* of *Tempestuous Propositions*, my *Answerer* shall pardon me, if I Appeal to the *Reader*, whether my *Question* was not *intelligible* without them.

For what man is so ignorant (unless his

Know-

Knowledg hath confounded and *Shipwrack'd* his *Reason*) as not to know, who I mean by *Presbyterians?* p 45. Yea, who would not ſuſpect the perſon *guilty*, that, when he is Indited flies, and *plaies leaſt in ſight*, or ſo diſguiſeth him, as he cannot be *known*: or when his *friends* return (as our *Author* for the *Presbyterians*) a *Non inventus*. But *he* and the world muſt know, that the *Presbyterians* like non of his *excuſes* or *ſubterfuges*. They cannot ſo eaſily *deny themſelves*; and methinks, he ſhould not *deny his Brethren*: they apply themſelves under *that Name* to the *King* for *Licences*, as our *Author* acknowledgeth; and yet he more then Intimates they are not, at leaſt moſt of them, *are not*, what they *tell* the *King they are*. And then what doth he make them, if they are not *Presbyterians?* But let him be anſwered, that ſuch as *deny* themſelves to be *Independents*, or *Anabaptiſts*, or *Quakers*, or *Papiſts*, and ſcruple and *mince* their Conformity with us; whether they be *Laity* or *Clergy*, will be called *Presbyterians* whether *he* will or no: and *ſuch*, he could not but know, I, eſpecially meant.

2. Who knows not what I mean, by our *Parochial Churches* or *Congregations?* and who knows not, too well, what is to be underſtood by *Gathering-Churches*; by the *former* practi-

ces of the *Independents*; but more especially, by these *Presbyterians*, since the *Indulgence?*

But, to talk of *gathering* Churches, and yet, of holding Communion *with us*, is a *Juggle*, unworthy our *Author*: who either doth, or should know; that it is *protestatio contra factum & quæstionem*. I mean, 'tis *generally* so.

I have, as you cannot but see, both in the *Question* as *proposed*, and as *stated*, and as *prosecuted*, set *gathering* of *Churches* in *opposition* to our *Parochial* Congregations. And what you say to any thing *else*, is not to the *point*. And the *general practice* of *Church-gatherers*, too well satisfies the world what they intend; and also that the Question was rightly propounded, and clearly stated to any unbyassed and unprejudiced Reader, what ever you say to confound it, and with your wonted *Elaborateness* to render it *unintelligible*, p. 40. and then complain that it is so.

But the *Learning* of some men, is not ill compared to a *Pedlars Pack*; though, not so much, for that there are *many* things that are *difficult* to be found; but rather, because, if they look for *any thing*, *every thing* comes to *hand*.

But this be far from our *Author*; to whom we must now hearken dilligently. He first sets down my Question verey honestly and *intirely*; p. 26, 27. then he *nibles* a little at it, and

and at length, *bites*: and tells the World, that I joyn *two* queſtions in *one*, *which we muſt look to have diſtinctly Anſwered.*

But what thoſe *two* queſtions are, and where they are diſtinctly *anſwered* I have look't, and find not. Would he not ſpeak *diſtinctly* to them becauſe he hates *Diviſions?* or was it his *prudence* to leave out *Conſcience?* for he hath told us, *p.* 21. that to decide this caſe is a *work of meer Chriſtian Prudence*: but where is *Conſcience* then? *Excluded?* by what Law? that ſhall be tried anon.

For I ſhall *now* addreſs my ſelf in *earneſt* to *review* the *whole* Queſtion: not in *two* only, but in the ſeveral Caſes depending upon it. A juſt examin whereof, will give me *occaſion* ſufficient to conſider, all that he hath ſaid to the *purpoſe againſt* me, as I find it ſcattered *up* and *down* his Book.

CHAP. VII.

Gathering-Churches *charged with* Schiſm *from the Church of* England, *and proved to be ſo from the Definition of this Church. Wherein he is told what the Church of* England, *and* Schiſm *from it is.*

THe *General* Queſtion betwixt us is this; *Whether it be Lawful for the Presbyte-*

rians to refuse Communion with our Parish Churches, and to gather themselves into Distinct and Separate Churches.

And upon a *Serious review* of it, and Consideration of all that the *Answerer* hath said against me, and my *Discourse* upon it; I do *renew* my Charge; and positively affirm, *that it is Unlawful*; and as it is *generally* practised, 'tis *a great and dangerous Schism* both against the *Church* of *England*, and *Particular Churches*: 'tis a Schism in its *own nature*, and sinful in it Self. 'Tis a Schism in the *Judgment* of the old *Nonconformists* called *Puritans*; and also in the *Judgment* of the *Presbyterians* before 1660. and lastly, that both in *Conscience* and *Prudence* it ought at *present* to be *avoided*, or *deserted*, by all such, especially, as are called *Presbyterians*. And all *this*, in its *several* parts, and in their order, as here set down, I undertake to make good.

1. Thus to *Separate* and to *Gather* Churches is a *Schism*, with respect to the *Church of England*. Now, as *Divines* speak of a Schism *in* a Church, and a Shism *from* a Church; so in a *diverse* respect, this practice is guilty of *both*. For if you consider the *Church of England*, as particular *Organized Church*, 'tis a *Schism* from: but if, as *part* of the *Universal* Visible Church only, as the *Nonconformists* use to term it, then 'tis *Schism in it*.

It

It is a Shiſm *from* the Church of *England* as ſuch; by *dividing* from its *Governours*, *Members*, *Worſhip* and *Aſſemblies*: as I more than Intimated in my Book, p. 8. and this ought to have been *diſtinctly* obſerved at leaſt, by my *Anſwerer*: but inſtead thereof, how he *ſtumbles* and *blunders!* looking carefully and making great *Outcries* after *that*, which I laid juſt *before him*.

You charge us, ſaith he, p. 37. with *Schiſm from the Church of England*. Again; p. 38. *Tell us what you mean by Schiſm from the Church of England*. Again; p. 35. *We are told of Schiſm from the Church of England*; as if it were a Monſtrous and *unheard of thing*: and then *puzzles*, pittyfully *puzzles* himſelf and his *Reader*, in an impertinent purſuit of the *Head of the Church* of *England*: as if without a certain and *infallible* knowledge of that, there could be no *ſuch thing* as a *Church of England*, or *Schiſm* from it. Wearying himſelf, for five or ſix pages, at his *old game*, of *nothing to the purpoſe*.

But, methinks, he labours with a very vehement deſire after this *great truth*, and could he be *ſure* to have it, he will not ſay how much *Money*, as well as *Pains*, he would give *for it*: yea he *roundly* offers me (how conſiſtent with his *gravity* I do not obſerve) but he roundly offers me *all the Money in his Purſe*

to

to make him understand but what the Church of England *is, p.* 35.

Well, if you will promise me to be *humble* and *teachable*, and that you are not *too old* to learn; though I have no mind to your *money*, I will shew my readiness, and charity at least, to relieve you in so great a *Streight*, though my *Judgement* may fail, and my *Definition* be as despicable as my *silly Arguments*.

The *Church of England*, is a *Community*, *Consisting of professed Christians*, *United in the same Government*, *Doctrine and Worship: according to the* 39. *Articles, and Homilies*; *Her Liturgy, and Canons and Laws*; *and divided into Parochial Assemblies, for the more convenient Worshipping of God.*

Might such a *Notion* of the *Church* of *England* have *superceded* all his *Finesses* of Wit and *Distinctions* about the *Constitutive Ecclesiastical Head*, as he speaks, (how *learnedly* I leave to his Friend Mr. *Bagshaw*) I think his labour might have been well enough spared: For he may Consider we are *United* in the same *Government*, and the *Pars Regens*; is the *only* part he himself requires to be added to the *Pars Subdita* to Constitute a *Church Organiz'd*, in a proper political sence. *p.* 38. Now you will not deny, *either* of these parts; and consequently, you have found the *whole* of the *Church of England*, as you say,

ſay, *Organiz'd* in a proper political Sence.

And, it hence follows, that 'tis *material* to our point, to determine *certainly*, what is the *Eccleſiaſtical* Head of this Church: whether, we that are Members of it, are all *united* in the *King* as *Perſona mixta cum Sacerdote*, and not meerly a *Civil* head as you inſinuate; he being *Supream in all Cauſes and over all Perſons as well Eccleſiaſtical as Civil.* Or whether, any think it more proper to Radicate this *Union* in his Grace of *Canterbury*, as *Primate over all England*: or whether in both the *Arch-Biſhops* who hold Communion in the ſame *Doctrine*, *Worſhip* and *Laws*: and in whom, *both* the Provinces are *United*: or laſtly, whether we are not rather United in *all* the *Biſhops* and Paſtors of the Church of *England*, as the *Pars Regens*; and our Government in the *Church*, conſidered *purely* and abſtractly from the *Civil* Government, be not rather an *Ariſtocracy* than a *Monarchy*. Whether *this*, or the *other* be the true; to know it is not *neceſſary*, nor of any uſe, that I can perceive in the preſent Controverſy.

But it is a certain *Vanity*, to ſay; becauſe I cannot find the *Head*, I will deny the *Body*, though I muſt withal deny my own *Senſes*. Becauſe you cannot know certainly, who was your *Father*, will you deny your *Mother* which is the *ſurer* ſide?

There

There is a *Church of England*, and what it is I have endeavoured to ſhew: and by the Nature of it, we may more eaſily conclude what *Schiſm* from it, is; and *who* are *guilty* of this; whether ſuch as Separate and *Gather Churches* or not.

CHAP. VIII.

What Schiſm *from the* Church *of* England *is, and whether* gathering of Churches, *as now is practiſed, be not guilty of it.*

1. WHat is *Schiſm* from the *Church of England?* ſure it is not a denying its *Doctrine*, or holding any thing contrary thereunto; he that holdeth *perverſum Dogma* only, is an *Heretick*, no *Schiſmatick*, as St. *Hierom* teacheth. Ad Tit. cap. 3.

Mr. *Newcomen*, a learned *Presbyterian*, as I obſerved in my laſt, lets the *Separatiſts* know, that their agreeing with *us* and the Reformed Churches in *Doctrines* that are Fundamental, their holding *one Head* and *one Faith*, doth not excuſe them from being guilty of *breach* of *unity*, ſo long as they hold not one *Body*, one *Baptiſm*. For he cites *Beza*, another learned Presbyterian. So that you may Annotat. in 1 Cor. 1. 10.

be

be willing to subscribe to the 39. *Articles*, and yet be *Schismaticks* from the *Church of England*.

It remains therefore, that such *Schism* relates to the *other* Bands of our *union* and fellowship with this *Church*; to wit, her *Government* and *Worship*, and consequent to the latter, her *Members* and *Assemblies*.

Thus you see we must return to our *first* determination; that *Schism from the Church of* England, *is a sinful dividing from, or a dissolving our union and communion with her in her Governors and Members, Worship or Assemblies*. This is the *least* that we mean by *Schism* from the *Church of England*; and is called *Separation* or Schism *negative*; which is made *positive*, and more formally such, when those that have so *separated*, set up *their Altar* against *hers*, and erect other *Congregations* in opposition to hers.

The *Schismatick* by Dr. *Hamond* out of *Ignatius*, is described *Of Schism. Epist. 40.* to be *Filius impius*, &c. *An impious Son, which having contemned the Bishops, and forsaken the Priests of God, dares constitute another Altar*. And again *Epist.* 57. the Schismaticks *are they, that having left their Bishop, set up for themselves abroad another false Bishop; and all their adherents are involved in the same guilt, who joyn with the Schismaticks against their Bishops.*

Two

Two things here must be supposed, 1. That we are the *pars subdita*, and do *owe* this communion and obedience to these *Governors* of the Church. 2. That they impose no *unlawful* conditions of this communion upon us; though if they should, how far we may *separate* must take its measure from such impositions, which is *another* Question to be discussed *anon* in another place; and at present I shall only add, that so far as I understand my *Answerer*, so far as the *people* are concerned in the conditions of our communion, we are not likely to *differ* much in this point. But for the *first* of these suppositions, if there be any force in *Scripture*-precepts, requiring obedience to our *spiritual Guides*, or in *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* Laws, which are very severe to that purpose, nothing can be more evident, than that all *English Christians* do *owe* communion and obedience to the Governors of the *Church of England*, whose Government stands established by *both* sorts of *Laws*, and is so acknowledged by the *Declaration* it self.

Defence of his Cure, p. 76. And your Friend Mr. *Baxter* is not obscure in this point; We must own, saith he, a *National Church*, as it is improperly so denominated from the *King*, that is the *Civil* Head---- and as it is a *community of Christians*, and a part

part of the Universal Church, *United* by the Concord of Her *Pastors*; who in *Synods* may represent the *whole* Ministry, and be the means of their *Agreement*.

He saith; we must own the *National Church*: I say, then we must not *disown* Her. And must we not likewise own the *King*, as the *Head* thereof? and all the *Bishops* and *Pastors* and Governors *under* Him? And then, what *liberty* is left us to *disown*, deny, or renounce their *Persons* or *Authority*?

Let such especially, as have taken the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, and received *Ordination* from *Episcopal* hands, yet better consider, those solemn *Obligations* upon them, added to the *Laws*; and take heed, in earnest, of *Perfidiousness* and *Perjury*.

Let them consider, what is to *renounce* all *foraign* Jurisdiction: and to their power to *assist* and *defend* all Jurisdiction (*Spiritual* as well as Temporal) *granted or belonging to the Kings Highness*: and how well a renouncing *Obedience* to the *Government* of the *Church*, consists with that which we have *sworn* therein.

It is true, all are not called *actually* to take this *Oath*; yet it is as true, that the *Ministers* and Officers of all Sorts, generally, are; and all *Graduates* in the *University*: and for *others*, as they are the *Kings Subjects*, they are un-

unquestionably taken to be, under the same *Obligation*, as to the matter of it; and are *born* to the *Duty* as well as the *Priviledge* of *Subjects* of this Realm: and therefore, we find, that this *Oath* is Administred; not only to *Oblige*, but rather, as a *Test* to trie, and also to *secure* the *fidelity* of such, as take it, as is evident in the *Statute*.

Again, let all *Ministers* Ordained by *Bishops* (I hope I have *now* to do with *one*) in the Name of *God*, seriously consider, what they *promised* to do at their *Ordination*; being most *solemnly interogated* by the Bishop in the Name of *God* and of his *Church*, as the words are.

More particularly: the *Bishop* demands; *Will you then give your faithful diligence always for to Minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath Commanded*; *and as* This Church *and Realm hath received the Same, according to Commandments of God, so that you may teach the People committed to your Cure and Charge, with* all diligence, *to* keep *and observe the* Same.

What *Answer* did you make hereunto? *I will do so by the help of the Lord.* And thus, you, at *once* acknowledge that the *Doctrine*, *Sacraments* and *Discipline* of Christ as received by this *Church*, are according to *Gods Commandments*; and that you would give

your

your *faithful diligence always*, ſo to Miniſter them, as *this* Church hath *received* them: and laſtly, that with *all diligence* you would teach your *People* to obſerve the *Same*.

Again, the *Biſhop* demands; *Will you all reverently Obey your Ordinary, and other chief* Miniſters, *unto whom is committed the Charge and Government over you*: following with a *glad Mind* and Will their Godly Admonitions, and *ſubmitting* your ſelves to their *Godly Judgment*.

What did you *Anſwer* to this? *I will do ſo, the Lord being my Helper*. Wherein you both *acknowledge* the *Government* of the Church over you, and *promiſe Obedience* thereunto.

And, it is no pleaſure to me, to obſerve; that *one*, that I dare not ſuſpect, not to be *thus* Ordained, ſhould notwithſtanding theſe *ſacred* Obligations, ſeem, even to *Print*, to *Glory*, that he never took the Oath of *Canonical Obedience*; which is, *to obey his Ordinary in all honeſt and lawful things*.

Thus for the *Miniſters*: and for the People, were they not generally *Baptized* by the *Miniſters*, and according to the *Order*, and in the *Publick* places of the Church of *England*? Have they not ſince, given their *Conſent*, as Members, by their *publick* attendance upon the *Worſhip* of the Church of *England*? Have they not generally *owned*,

for a considerable time together, some many years, that *relation* to their *particular* Churches and *Pastors*? Is *all* this nothing to signifie their *Union* with our Church, and *Obligation* to her Government? Is it nothing in our *Authors* Judgement? I cannot believe it; I am sure 'tis something in Mr. *Baxters* Opinion, as I shall shew anon.

But *wherein* are we obliged to obey our *Governours* as we are *Members* of the Church of *England*? The *measure* of this Obedience, are the *Laws* and *Canons* and the *Rubrick* in the *Liturgy*: and the main Scope and intention of *all* these, is to direct you how you are to *Worship* God in our *Parochial* Assemblies; as also, to demean your selves in all *due Reverence* to your Superiours, and *Brotherly love* and fellowship together, as *Members* of the *same* Body, the *Church of England*.

And to dissolve or *renounce this* our Communion with our *Brethren* (as well as with *Governours*) in those *Assemblies*, and in that *Worship*, is so far to renounce that *Communion* which we ow, and is due from us all to the Church of *England*; and is that thing, which is deservedly branded with the black Name of *Schisme from the Church of England*: (which is the *other* Branch of that Schisme before mentioned) especially, if the *Deriders* proceed to the *Erecting of Anti Churches*,

ches, as Mr. *Baxter* properly calls them.

For our ſeveral *Parochial* Aſſemblies, are *Parts* and Members of the *Great Body* of our Church, into which, the Church is *divided* for our Convenient *Worſhiping* of God, (as you heard in the *Definition*) wherein, all *individual* perſons are bound to attend upon Gods Worſhip according to the foreſaid *Rules*, quatenus *Members* of this Church of *England*.

But I ſhall have an occaſion to ſpeak largly, of Schiſme from *particular* Congregations, in another place; and at preſent, would fain hope, that ſome thing hath been ſaid to ſhew what *Schiſme from the Church of England is*.

This is the Sum. *Schiſme from the Church of England is a ſinful dividing from Her*, in Her *Governours*, *Members*, *Worſhip* or *Aſſemblies*. Which, and much more is done by thoſe that diſpiſe her *Government*, renounce her *Worſhip* and *Communion* with Her *Members* in the *Publick* places of it; and Erect *New Congregations* for a new *manner* of *Worſhip* and *Diſcipline*, under other *Governours*, in oppoſition thereunto; according to the *Laudable* practiſes now on foot.

By this time, I hope, my *Anſwerer* ſees, after his long and *ranging* Scrutiny for the diſcovery of this *Schiſm*, and all in vain,

how *pertinently* he demands, p. 38. *Is every difference, in things unnecessary, from the Major part, a Schism from them?*

Again, p. 39. *'Tis our disobedience to the Church that is our Schism.* This he saies, and then quickly wipes it off, with his own pleasant *Answer*; But *Fidelity to our King commandeth the disowning of Usurpers.* But I might spoil his *Mirth*, should I examine his *meaning*.

Again, p. 40. he cries out; *Whoever took any Act of Disobedience in a Circumstance to be a Schism?*

But, in earnest, had not these little *frisks* and extravagancies been happily prevented, had he heeded me at *first?* is a sinful *dividing* from the Church, in Her *Government* and *Worship*, and setting up *Churches* in opposition to Her, in *both*, is this no more than a *difference in things unnecessary from the Major part*, or than a *bare Act of Disobedience in a Circumstance?* I know you will not say it: and 'tis vain to say, that *you* intend no more: I wrote against *those* that do.

What has he *more* to Answer? Why, the *Schism* I mention, p. 39. is not such as *Martin* and *Gildas* made? what then? if it be *worse*, it is not *such*. You should rather have compar'd your *Brethren* in this *new* Worke to the other *Martin*, called *Mar-Prelate*.

But

But this *Martin*, you ſay, *Renounced Communion with the Biſhops and their Synods (all his life) who had proſecuted the* Priſcillianiſts *with the Secular Sword: and Gildas pronounced him no excellent Chriſtian that called the* Brittiſh *Clergy in his time,* Prieſts *or* Miniſters, *and not* Traitors, *as he did himſelf: yet neither of theſe holy men are called* Seperatiſts *or* Schiſmaticks.

What follows? might they not be *Schiſmaticks*, though they were not *called* ſo? You will find ſome advantage by the Argument, for I have not called *you* ſo, yet. Perhaps *Gildas* might be bold with his Brethren, and call them *Traitors*; but if *unjuſtly*, 'twas *ill* done, though no *Schiſme*. If *juſtly*; there may be *Proditores* found of *your* acquaintance too, I make no doubt; though, if you do not urge me much, I ſhall not *call* them *ſo*. You do not think *that time* is returned upon us, and that he hath not the *Character* of an *excellent Chriſtian*, that hath not the *gift*, of calling the *Prieſts Traitors*.

So much for *Gildas*: But for his Companion *Martin*, I might have given him *Coarſer Entertainment*, had it not been for the kindneſs of *Another Gildas*, that not *long ſince*, ſpake more in his favour, than *you* do *now*.

His words, on his behalf, are theſe; *I have told you in the ſtory of* Martin, *how he ſepa-*

Baxters Defence, p. 76. *rated from the Synods of those Individual Bishops*; and from *their Local Communion without Seperation from the Office, the Churches, or any other Bishop*: And then for ought I know *Martin* might be a good honest fellow. Do *you* all the *rest*, that *he* did, and by my consent, you should be excused from *sitting in Synods*.

For *Martin* it seems denied not *Communion* with the *Churches*; much less set up an *Altar* and Church of his *own* in opposition to them: If he had done so, I would have said *he* had been a *Rank Schismatick*, though I spare *you*.

It is confest that the *Presbyterians* do generally agree, that the *Disciplinary* part, or Form of *Government*, is not *Essential* to a *National* Church; yet they affirm, that the *Verity* of a *National* Church, consists in its *Agreement* in the same *Doctrine* and *Worship*: and consequently, though *differences* in *Doctrine* are not, yet a *breach* of its *Unity*, and making *divisions* in a point of *Worship*, is a plain *Schisme* from a *National* Church acording to the Principles of the *Presbyterians*. Mr. *Cawdrey* spake not his own *peculiar* opinion, when he said, *p.* 178. *I believe those men, that raise differences in a Reforming Church*, he meant this *National Church*, and

Vid. Cawdry *Independ. Schisme, page* 172, 173.

per-

perſiſt in keeping open thoſe Diviſions, Seperating alſo into other new Churches; doe as well deſerve the name of *Schiſmaticks*, as thoſe that make differences, in one *Particular* Church.

Upon the *whole*, then, you perceive how *aptly* you ask, *p.* 42. *Whether a Miniſter may not remove from one Pariſh to another*; or *any man remove his dwelling into another Pariſh*, &c. and be no *Schiſmatick?* an old objection of Dr. *Owens*, and anſwered by Mr. *Cawdrey*: that they remove to Churches of the *ſame Conſtitution*, a thing never queſtioned, but alwaies allowed, both by the *Union* and *Cuſtome* of this *National* Church.

Again, and alike *pertinently* you ask, *Whether a Seperation of one Pariſh from another be Schiſm?* or whether I mean by it, *a Local Seperation* only, as you gravely enquire, *p.* 33. Or, *whether little differences in the modes of Worſhip*, particularly, *in the manner of the Miniſters Prayer* (and he ſhould have added, *in dividing his Text*) be *Schiſm?* but he prevents my Anſwer, by *denying* theſe himſelf. Thoſe that differ *thus*, he ſaith, and thereby doubtleſs very wiſely and to general Satisfaction determineth; *theſe*, ſaith he, *p.* 34. *are not Seperated Churches, any otherwiſe than Local, and in ſuch Modal Differences.*

Thus, what the *Church of England*, and

what *Schism* from it, is. But at the beginning of the discourse, 'twas hinted; that if we would consider the *Church of England*, not *organice* but *entitative*, as some speak; that is, as it is a part or member of the *Universal* visible Church; even in this consideration of it, *Separation* and the present practice of gathering Churches, is a *Schism in* the *Church of England*, if *not* so *from* it. And by those *intestine Ruptures* and rents it is *causing* in the midst of her, gives her too much cause to complain; *O my Bowels, my Bowels!* While it tears in pieces her *Old* and *Stated Congregations*; tramples upon her *Liturgy*; defies her *Worship*; renounceth her *Pastors*; throws down all her ancient *Land-marks* and laudable *bounds* of her *particular* Churches; and endeavours every where to Erect *new Altars* and Seperate Churches that were *never before* heard of in the Christian world, but amongst *wild* and desperate and Schismatical *Sectaries*.

But, *this* will meet us in the *next* Chapter, when we speak of *Schism* from *particular* Congregations.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Gathering Churches, *a* Schiſme from *particular* Parochial *Churches. The* general *Nature of Schiſm.*

THe preſent practice of *Gathering Churches*, is not only a *Schiſm* from the Church of *England*, but a *Schiſm* alſo from our particular *Parochial* Congregations.

This comes now to be evinc'd; and I ſhall take my *advantage* for the doing of it, from an Obſervation of Mr. *Cawdrey* againſt Dr. *Owen*, and the Independents. *There was*, ſaith *he, and is, another Church-State in* England *in our particular Churches*: from theſe, alſo, they have *moſt of them, as once of them*, (or, they had been once of them.) *Palpably Separated.* *Indepond. great Schiſ. p. 177.*

I am now to charge the preſent practice, of our *New Church gatherers*, and their *New Churches*, with the like Schiſm, from particular *Parochial* Churches, whereof they *are*, or lately *were*, Members, and ought ſo to have *continued.*

To cut our work as *ſhort* as may be; I ſhall confine my ſtrength within *one Argument*; which I conceive the cleereſt, and moſt

moſt likely to put an *end* to the matter in debate; and 'tis taken from the *nature* and definition of *Schiſm:* wherein we ſhall ſhew, what we are to underſtand by Schiſm; and how the preſent *gathering of Churches* out of our Churches agrees with it; not doubting, but then, the *concluſion* will find its own way well enough.

What is *Schiſm* then? I ſhall give you the *eaſieſt* and the leaſt controverted *definition* of it; and *ſuch*, as was never excepted againſt by any *Presbyterian* that I ever heard of: 'Tis this; Schiſm is a *cauſleſs*, or as others, a *voluntary, unwarrantable ſeparation from a true Church.*

Here are *two* parts to be conſidered in the *general*; *ſeparation* from a *true* Church; and the *formal, ſpecial* and *diſtinguiſhing part* of it, coucht in the words *cauſleſs*, or *unwarrantable* and *voluntary.*

1. *Schiſm is a ſeparation from a true Church*; it is ſo, in the proper and peculiar nota-
Cameron. cap. de Schiſ. tion of it: the word σχίσμα, *Schiſm*, is a ſtranger to *prophane* Authors, and the *Old Teſtament*, and is only to be found in the *New Teſtament*; ſo that it only intends ſomething about the *Chriſtian Church*; and what *that* is, muſt be underſtood by the *New Teſtament*, and *Eccleſiaſtical*

ſiaſtical Writers, who have taken it *thence*.

It is commonly affirmed, that in the *Scripture-uſe* of it, it ſometimes ſignifies *diviſion* among Chriſtians in *opinion* only: but I have obſerved, that *uſually* thoſe *opinions*, were *ſuch* as had a tendency to *diviſions* in *practice*, as I am of *Paul*, &c. but 'tis generally acknowledged that differences in *practice*, eſpecially touching *Divine Worſhip* (whether from the ſignification of the *word*, which is properly a *rent* or diviſion, or whether from the more frequent *uſe* of it *that way* in *Scripture*, or for ſome *other reaſon*) I ſay, difference in *practice* about *Divine Worſhip*, hath long ſince *obtained* and appropriated to it ſelf the *name* of Schiſm.

Sometimes ſuch *diviſion in* the Church, when there hath been no *actual ſeparation from* the Church, is conceived to be called Schiſm in *Scripture*. 1 *Cor.* 1. 10.

And *this notion* excluſive of all *other* kind of Schiſm in Scripture, Dr. *Owen* eſpouſed, contrary both to *Scripture reaſon*, and the general apprehenſion of the *Ancient* and *Modern* Divines, as Mr. *Cawdrey* hath ſufficiently argued.

Separation from a Church is a more *obvious diviſion*, and conſequently a more *notorious* kind of Schiſm; and it ſeems more reaſonable

able to argue, if the Holy Ghost called the *first buds* and beginnings of seperation, by the name of *Schism*, it was to *deter* the *dividers* from the *sin* in its *ripeness* and accused *fruits*, which more *hainously* merited *that* black *title*; as our Saviour calls *lust*, *adultery*. *Schisma seperat ab Ecclesia*; Schism seperates from the Church, saith St. *Hierom*.

To proceed, *this* separation *from* the Church, as a learned *Presbyterian* asserteth, is from the Church as *Catholick*, which he calls *Donatism*, or from a *particular* Church; and that, saith he, is *properly* Seperatism.

Lastly, this Schismatical seperation is *negative* or *positive*; the former is only *simplex secessio*, when men do peaceably and quietly *withdraw* their *communion* from the Church, in *part* or in *whole*, to enjoy their consciences in a *private* way. The other, called *positive* seperation, is when persons *thus withdrawn*, do gather into a *distinct* and opposite *body*, setting up a Church against a Church, to worship God in a seperated way themselves; which St. *Augustine* calls, a setting up *Altar* against *Altar*; alluding to that act of King *Ahaz*, in setting up an *Altar* of his own making, after the *fashion* of that which he saw at *Damascus*, besides the *Lord's Altar*.

Camuron. de Schis.

2 King. 16.

And

And this is it, saith *Cameron.* and most that write upon the point, which in a *peculiar* manner, and by way of emineney is, and deserves to be called by the name of *Schism.*

Thus we see, that *gathering* our selves into *new Churches*, is the *complement* and perfection of Schism; the very *Apex & extrema Schismatis linea*, as *Cameron. speaks.*

This evil, as I lately hinted, hath its *beginnings*, and usually goes on by *degrees* to this *perfection.* In the Church of *Corinth*, it first began with a *factious esteeming* of one *Minister* above another: One saith, *I am of* Paul, *&c.* at length it came to ζηλος και ἐρις και διχοστασιαι. Which Mr. *Baxter* renders *emulation, strife* and *separation*, or *factions*, or *dividing* into *several parties.* This appeared somewhat higher, *Chap.* 11. for they would not eat their *Love-Feasts*, and *Parens* thinks, they would not eat the *Lord's Supper* together; but those that were for *Paul* would communicate among *themselves*; so those that were for *Apollos*, and those that were for *Peter.*

His Def. of Princ. of Con. p. 2.

Chap. 11.

And though they did not *gather themselves* into *stated* Congregations, or *absolutely* seperate into *several* Churches, (for they *came together*, though to little purpose) yet their *divisions* are not

only

only called *Schism*, but a *despising the Church of God.*

But if this *progress* of *Schism* was so smartly rebuked, we may the less wonder to find the *Apostles* so very *severe* against the *Gnosticks*, and those more *perfected* Schismaticks, that afterwards *drew Disciples after them wholly from the Church*, and made *false Apostles* and *Anti-Churches*. ἀποδιωρίζοντες *extra terminos Ecclesiæ educentes, segregantes fideles a fidelibus*, and making distinct and seperate, and opposite *parties* and *meetings* for the *worship* of God. Mr. *Hale* observes these *two* things make Schism *compleat*, the *chusing* of a *Bishop* in *opposition* to the *former*, a thing very frequent among the *Ancients*, and which many times was the *cause* and *effect* of Schism; and then the *erecting of a new Church* for the *dividing* parts to meet in *publickly*, and this he calls *Ecclesiastical sedition*; and *Ames*, *peccatum gravissimum*; a most grievous sin, both in its *nature* and *effects*: For *Division*, so far as it proceeds, whether in *Natural*, *Civil*, or *Ecclesiastical Bodies*, is the *dissolution* and destruction of it.

Oecumenius.

Clem. Alex.

Tract of Schism, p. 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The differencing *Nature of Schism. The Answerers* Objections *answered; especially the* Preaching of the ejected *Ministers.*

I Will suppose, we are *agreed* that the *general* nature of Schism is *such* a *seperation* from a *true* Church as we have shew'd; but to make it *unlawful*, and to merit the *evil* and *usual* sence of the word, it must be *causeless*, *unwarrantable*, and as Mr. *Hales* term is, *unnecessary*; when it is *so*, is to be *carefully* stated: for this indeed is the *punctum difficultatis*, and the very *hinge* upon which this *controversie* turns.

Herein, that I may prepare to argue with due *closeness*, I shall continue to aim at the sence of *Presbyterians*: And as I have before, I shall here also follow the steps of Mr. *Brinsley*, late Minister of *Yarmouth*, not only because his Book of Schism seems to me *judicious*, and exact as to our point: and he therein follow so excellent a person as *Cameron*. but likewise for that he was an eminent *Non-conformist* (as a *Minister* only) for I have been well informed, that though he *ceased* preaching at *Bartholomew*, 1662. yet

yet he kept no *private* meetings, but ordinarily attended on the *publick* worship, in the place where he lived: besides, his Book was *licensed* by Mr. *Cranford*, with a sufficient commendation; and was Preacht and Printed in the *Presbyterian Service* against the *Sectaries*; and no doubt, *his Brethren* of that *perswasion* did then heartily *concur* with him in the *point*.

This Mr. *Brinsley*, *p.* 34, 35. states the matter thus; Seperation is *unwarrantable*, either for the *ground* or *manner*; the former an *unjust*, the latter a *rash* seperation, each a *Schism*; wherein he follows *Cameron*.

I shall vary his *method* a little, but keep close to his sense; and then an *unjust separation* is two-fold; either when there is *no cause*, and it is absolutely *causless*; or when the cause is *light*, and not sufficient to warrant it. *Seperation is rash*, when there being cause supposed sufficient, yet it is done in an *undue manner*.

1. Separation is *unjust*, when it is *without cause* given by the Church; and as he enlargeth, "When there is no Persecution, no "spreading Error or Heresie, no Idolatry, no "Superstition maintained or practised, but "the Church is *peaceable* and *pure*, and that "both for *Doctrine* and *Worship*; and in a "good

" good measure free from *ſcandals* (which no " Church ever *wholly* was) now in ſuch a caſe " to *ſeperate*, is an *unjuſt* ſeperation, and " *Schiſm*.

If this be indeed the *ſtate* of the caſe, whether the *parties think* they have *cauſe* to ſeperate or not, I think it is not much *material*, except to *aggravate* their *crime*: For, if they *think* they have cauſe, they are *plain Seperatiſts*; and if they do *not* think ſo, and yet *divide* the Church by a ſeperation *cauſeleſs*, in their *own opinion* as well as *truth*, they are *far worſe*. Neither will any *wantonneſs* of ſpirit of this kind, though *boy'd* up by a *diſtaſte* taken at our *Guides*, or an higher eſteem of *other* Teachers, or pretences of *greater purity*, much leſs an *ill will* to the ſtate of the *Church* from which we ſhall thus ſeperate, admit an *excuſe* from any ſober and wiſe man.

2. There may be ſome *cauſes* of *offence* given us by our Church, but they *ſuch*, as may by no meanes *warrant* a ſeperation: cauſe of *offence* is not always cauſe of *ſeperation*; which our *Author* calls a *light* cauſe. He enlargeth; " Poſſibly ſome ſleight *oppoſi-* " *tion*, or perſecution, it may be, by ſome " ſmall *pecuniary* Mulcts; ſome leſſer *errors* " in Doctrine, not fundamental, nor near " the foundation; ſome *corruptions* in or about

"the *worship* of God, but those not *destru-*
"*ctive* to the Ordinances; being not in *sub-*
"*stance*, but in *ceremony*; and those *such* as
"the person offended is not enforced to be
"*active* in; *scandals* few, and those *only tole-*
"*rated*, not allowed. All tolerable evils,
"such as *charity* may well bear with; this
"*ground* is not sufficient to *bear* a seperation.
You see he is *full* and particular; and in all *this*, I believe he referred in his thoughts to the state of *our* Church *heretofore*, as in the *former* he struck at the *Popish*.

The learned *Amesius*, whose Principles were somewhat *Congregational*, hath said *much* to the same purpose in a *few* words. *Separation from a true Church is sometimes lawful, if one cannot remain in its communion*, sine communicatione in peccatis, *without communicating in her sins*: if there be *manifest* danger of *seduction*, and if we are *compell'd* to depart by oppression and *persecution*. Thus *he*. And we may suppose he thought he made a full *enumeration* of all the *just* causes of departing from a true Church; and that in any *other* case seperation was *unlawful*.

Cas. de Schism.

Others indeed have more *compendiously* and fully drawn all the *rules* in this case into *one* point, Seperation is *unwarrantable*, if communion with the Church may be *with-*

out

out sin. And indeed what can justifie a practice so contrary to *love* and *peace*, and of so dangerous *consequence*, but the avoiding of *sin?* Our general Answer to the charge of *Schism* by the *Papists* is, we must not *partake* with your *sins*; and I think *all parties* consent in this *common proposition*, where the *conditions* of communion with a Church are *sinful*, we are *not bound* to that communion, for we must obey *God* rather then *man*.

I am sure this was *current* Doctrine with the *Non-conformists*, called *Puritans* heretofore, in the *defence* of communion with the Church of *England*. "Let the *abuses* (saith "Mr. *Ball*) be *many* or *great*, yet if I may be "present at the true *worship* of God *without* "*sin*, (consent unto, or approbation of *such* "*abuses* or corruptions) in *voluntary* seperation, I sin against *God*, his *Church*, and mine "own *soul*. *His Defence, 2. Par. 22.*

This was also undoubted by the late *Presbyterians*; in stead of many, let Mr. *Cawdrey* against Dr. *Owen* be heard, for methinks he speaks to the *purpose*. It is (saith he) no *duty* of Christs imposing, no *priviledg* of his purchasing, either to *deprive a mans self of his Ordinances* for *other mens sins*; or to set up a *new Church* in opposition to a *true* *Independ. a great Schism.*

Church, as no Church rightly constituted for want of *some reformation* in *lesser matters*. And Mr. *Corbet*, and the *Author of Evangelical Peace and Unity*, if I understand him, puts the *whole debate* upon the *same issue* with us. So *Bagshaw* also, *&c.*

Among these *light* causes, which will by no means *warrant* a seperation, Mr. *Baxter* hath laboured to throw down these *four Superstitions*, as he calls them, which some *religious people have brought up*.

Cure of Church Divisions, 291.

1. "That we are guilty of the sins of all "*unworthy communicants*, if we communicate "with them, though their *admission* is not by "our *fault*.

2. "That he whose judgement is against "a *Diocesan Church*, may not lawfully join "with a *Parish Church*, if the Minister be "but *subject* to the *Diocesan*.

3. "That whatsoever is "*unlawfully commanded*, is "not lawful to be *obeyed*.

*See Cure of Church Divisions, p.*194.

4. "That it is unlawful to do any thing "in the Worship of God which is *imposed* "*by men*, and is not *commanded* it self in the "*Scripture*.

But enough of the *false grounds* of seperation that render it *causeless*; for that they are either *really* none, or else light or *insufficient*.

The

The *Second* Exception againſt *Seperation* was taken from the undue *manner* of proceeding in it, for which it is termed *Raſh*; and therefore *Schiſmatical*; though the *ground* be *juſt*. That is, as Mr. *Brinſly* explaineth himſelf, *p* 25. 'When it is *ſudden* and *heady*: 'without due *endeavour* and *expectance* of *Reformation* in the Church: it is then *Raſh*, 'and conſequently an *unwarrantable* Separation, in as much as it is oppoſite to *Charity*.

Mr. *Baxters Advice* is excellent here: 'If 'Corruptions blemiſh and diſhonor the Congregation; doe not ſay (let *ſin* alone; I muſt not oppoſe it for fear of *Diviſion*) but be the *forwardeſt* to *reduce* all to the will of *God*. And yet, if you cannot prevail, as you deſire; be the *backwardeſt* to *Divide* and Seperate; and do it not, without a *certain Warrant*, and *extream neceſſity*. Reſolve with *Auſtine*, I will not be the *Chaff*, and yet I will not go out of the *Floor*, though the Chaff be *there*. Never give over your juſt *deſire* and *endeavour* of *Reformation*; and yet as long as you can poſſible avoid it, *forſake* not the Church, which you deſire to *Reform*. As *Paul* ſaid, to them that were to forſake a Sea-wrack'd Veſſel, *If theſe abide not in the Ship, ye cannot be ſaved*. Many a one, by *unlawful* flying, and ſhifting for his own

Cure of Church Div. p. 80.

'own greater *Peace* and *Safety*, doth much 'more *hazard* his *own* and *others*.

3. *Ames* gives me occasion to hint one thing more: *Secessio vero Totalis*, &c. *A Total Secession or Seperation with absolute renouncing or rejecting all Communion, cannot be lawfully practiced towards a True Church: but partial only*, quatenus Communio, *so far as Communion cannot be exercised without sin.* Cas. de Schis. 307.

I Wish heartily, my *Brethren* would consider, whether not only *renouncing all Communion* with, but setting up *other Churches* against our Churches, be not, in his sence, a *Total Seperation*; and consequently *Sinful*. Or whether you, that so use us, do yet *retain Communion* with our Parish-Churches so far as you *know you may without sin*. But this by the way:

The *Summe* is, when the Church gives no *such* cause of offence, as may justifie Seperation; when the *Conditions* of her Communion require nothing of her Members, whereby if they Communicate, they shall be *Actual Sinners*; when persons, let the *cause* be never so just, shall unadvisedly, without due *endeavours* and patient *expectance* of a *Reformation*: lastly, when they shall for some *few things*, at which they take offence, *totally* forsake Communion with a *True Church*, and gather them-

themſelves into *Anti-Churches*; they are, in *all theſe Caſes*, guilty of *Schiſme*, in the judgment of the moſt *Non-Conformiſts*, of *all ſorts*; and, indeed, of all men, that have conſidered the *Point* and the *Nature* of Schiſm. The *Aſſumption*, we ſhall make *hereafter*--- and at preſent, only take notice of what the *Anſwerer* hath ſaid to prevent it.

He gives us, *p* 16,17. *eight Differences*, betwixt the *Old Seperatiſts* and the *Preſent Non-Conformiſts*; and then concludes in all theſe, they differ from *Seperatiſts*, though they *gather Churches*. Theſe differences are particularly conſidered hereafter. The *firſt three* of theſe Differences, are a *Complement* to *us* and our *Pariſhes*: the *four next*, are a *Complement* to *themſelves*: in the *laſt*, I think, he is in earneſt for himſelf, but he hath to do with a *headſtrong party*, that will not obey, either his *Word* or *Example*, in *deſiring nothing more, than with Love and Concord, to carry on with us the ſame work of Chriſt*. But what is *all this*, to excuſe them from being *Seperatiſts*, that run away *from* us, and *draw Deſciples* after them: that refuſe (I am ſure in *fact*, what ever ſome may ſay) the *leaſt Communion* with us, in our *publick Aſſemblies*, and gather *New Churches* for themſelves out of them.

This they do, though *you know* we, generally, have *not* given them *Cauſe* to do it: And

they do it *Rashly*, and *Totally*, and all your *little devices*, will never *alter* the *Nature* of things, or excuse it from *gross Schism* in the *Judgment* of all that were not *Seperatists*, and spake their mind, before the *present Temptation* dazled mens eyes.

'Tis in vain to flie to your *Common* Refuge; the strength of this Argument will not suffer you to be quiet in it; who ever before you made this a *warrantable* ground of *Seperation*, that they might *Serve God better?* if finding *positive* faults in our worship, would not excuse *them heretofore*; much less will *negative* ones excuse *you* from Seperation. But they thought those were faults and *just Causes* of Seperation which were *not*; true, and they were mistaken: but yet, they had more to say for themselves, it seems, than you have, who do the *same things*, without alledging so *much ground*, and think to be wholly free, from the *same charge*.

Sir, *Schism* consists in *practice*; and whatever you think on't, or, however you would palliate the matter, where that *practice* that truly answers the *definition* of *Schism* is found, it will be *Schism* do what you can. Is there any *Institution* of Christ, *that they must gather Churches out of true Churches*, to make a *purer Church?* Ans. Mr. *Cawdrey Indep.* p. 198.

But I *prevent* my design: *Shism*, we have shewed

shewed is a *causeless unwarrantable Seperation*, and 'tis true; and so my *Answerer* might have understood *me*, and his *Brethren*, in my *last*: I spake in the language of the *Presbyterians*, and a little *Candour*, would have *supposed* that both, I and they, intended by *gathering Churches* out *of Churches*, such as was *causeless*, *unwarrantable* and *unnecessary*; for that, they were still ready, if need required, to prove the *Independant Separation such*, as I shall be, anon, to do *yours*.

It is, therefore, some trouble to me to hear *you* ask, as if somthing of *Argument* were lodg'd in it; *Whether a persons removal from one Parish to another to inhabit there, were Schism?* p. 48. and yet I conceive, you have it more than *twice* over in your book. You ask again, must no *Churches* be gathered out of *Rome?* I fear not many for you: but for a full and plain answer to this, I remit you to Mr. *Baxters Cure of Church Divisions*, p. 81, 82, 83. *Which if it seem not plain and full to you, it is because you understand not Christian Sense and Reason.*

Again, p. 44. did not the *Parliament* take a *Church out of a Church* when *they seperated Covent-Garden from Martins Parish?* doubtless, 'twas either *with* cause or *not*; 'twas *warrantable* or *not*; 'twas *necessary* or *not*: but the jest is spoiled, if it were a Church of the *same Constitution, with consent of the persons concern'd* & by *lawful Authority*. Had

Had you no place to argue *Schismatical* but *Covent-garden*; I would advise you, as a *friend*, to take a little more heed what you say about *that place*, for fear of one of those *Schismaticks* which in other places, you honor, as *Usurpers*, concern'd in your *next Section*.

But behold the *Man at Arms* fully Accoutred, without all *fear*, but a great deal of *wit* and *courage* makes a challenge to the *factious Disputers*, as his *Catholick* language is: and 'tis this, as you may read it under his *own hand*.

Obj. *I undertake*, saith he, *to* prove, *that* Dr. Manton, *Dr.* Seaman, *&c. with the* People *subject to them, as Pastors, were* true Churches. *Prove you, if you can, that on* Aug. 24. 62. *they were* degraded, *and these Churches were* dissolved *in any reason, which any Churches for* 600. *years after Christ, would. If not, you seem your self to accuse their* Successors *of* Schism, *for drawing part of the people from them meerly by the Advantage of having the* Temples *and* Tythes, *and so* gathering Churches out of true Churches.

Ans. A Marvellous Undertaker! he will undertake to prove one Proposition, and let the rest shift for them selves.

Dr. *Manton* and Dr. *Seaman*, and their *People* were *true Churches*: and this he will *prove*: but what if a man should venture to disappoint him, and *not deny* it?

Again;

Again; prove if you can, that these *Paſtors* were *degraded*, and these *Churches diſſolved Aug.* 24. 62.

But what if a man has a mind to be *friends* with him here too? and ſhould grant that *thoſe* Miniſters were not *degraded* then, but only *ejected* and inhibited the *exerciſe* of their Miniſtry within the *Church* of *England*: and that *thoſe Churches* were not *diſſolv'd* by having *New Paſtors*; no more, than the *Kingdom* when the *King* dies. And yet, certainly the *King* and *People*, are as much the *Conſtitutive parts* of a *Kingdom*; as *Paſtor* and *People* of a *Church*.

Who will ſay, that conſiders what he ſaith, *that a particular Church is diſſolved by the death or removal of the Paſtor*. The *River* is the *Same*, though the *Lands* on each ſide, change their *Proprietors*.

But what then? Suppoſe all this be quietly granted him, what then? then, *thoſe that ſucceeded them* are *Schiſmaticks*; or *you* ſeem to accuſe them of *Schiſm*: how ſo? for *drawing* away *part* of the people from them. Whither? to another *manner* of Worſhip which the *Laws* required; and which, the *Ejected refuſed*.

But how did they *draw the People?* by doing their *duty* in the *Temples*, as by good Authority *Inſtituted* and *Inducted* thereunto. *Inſtitu-*

ſtituted as *Paſtors* to have the *Cure* of *Souls*; and *Inducted* into the *Temples* and *Tythes*.

But laſtly, why do you ſay they drew a *part* of the people onely, and not the *whole*?

Ought not *the whole*, worſhip God *undivided*, and *with one accord in the Temples*? or muſt the *place* be removed with the Paſtor? I quire not *who made* the *difference*, but I know who makes the *Diviſion*, let them anſwer it how they can, to *God* and the *King*, the *Church* and their *Succeſſors*.

Thoſe *Paſtors* were *Ejected* out of the Temples by lawful *Authority*: the *People* are *bound* to worſhip *God* in the *Temple*, as they have *opportunity*; and no where elſe, in *oppoſition* to the publick Worſhip: (the Conſequence *here*, I think may vie with yours *above*) therefore, *theſe Paſtors had no opportunity to exerciſe their Paſtoral Office to thoſe People; and where there is no opportunity, there is no duty*; in Mr. *Baxters* Divinity, Second Admon. to *Bagſh.* 96.

But you ſay, *you muſt Preach*, the Reverend Dr. *Gouge* ſaith, No.: 'The Inhibition of *Idolators* and Infidels 'made ſimply againſt preaching of the *Goſpel*, becauſe they 'would have it utterly Suppreſſed in this 'caſe, he ſaith, no *ſufficient* inhibition to bind 'the Conſcience; it is directly and apparent-'ly

Whole Armour of God. 570.

'ly contrary to Gods Word. But when *Chri-*
'*ſtian Magiſtrates* inhibite Miniſters to
'*Preach*, it is becauſe they think them un-
'fit and unmeet, either for ſome notorious
'Crimes, or for ſome Erronious Opinions, to
'exerciſe their Miniſterial Functions. In *theſe*
'*Caſes*, *Such* as are ſo inhibited, ſo far forth
'as they are inhibited, *Ought not to Preach.*
'Neither are particular and *private* men
'(much leſs the *parties* inhibited) to Judge of
'the *Cauſe* of the inhibition, whether it be
'juſt or unjuſt: but as they who are *appoint-*
'*ed* by the preſent Government, to *Ordain*
'Miniſters, are to judg of their fitneſs there-
'unto; ſo likewiſe, of their *unfitneſs.*

I have thought hitherto, that *diſtinction* of the *Office*, and of the *exerciſe* of that *Office*, had gone uncontroled among *Presbyterians*: and that, though the *Miniſters* of Chriſt depend not, even upon the *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* for their *Office*, and he cannot *degrade* them: yet *quoad Exercitium*, as to the Exerciſe of it, within his Dominions, they *did*; and that he had power to *Silence* ſuch as *he* Judged *unmeet* to Preach.

Mr. *Baxter* doth much encourage me to perſiſt in the ſame *Opinion*, more than once. *The Authority of the King and lawful Magiſtrates*, ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, *is more about the Circumſtantials of* 2d Admon. to Bag. 117

Worſhip

Worſhip (as whether *Abiathar ſhall be High Prieſt*, &c.) then the *Falſe Teachers were about that Doctrine.*

He, more than Intimates, that the *Magiſtrates Power* extends to the Appointing who ſhall be *High Prieſt*; and who doubt, but that he hath *equal* power to appoint who ſhall be *Paſtor* of *Covent-Garden.*

Again, hear Mr. *Baxter* what he ſaith, more largly upon the Point. *Diſput.* 223. 'Doubtleſs the *Magiſtrate* himſelf hath ſo 'much Authority in *Eccleſiaſtical* Affairs, 'that if he Command a *qualified* perſon 'to *Preach* the Goſpel, and Command 'the *People* to receive him; I ſee not, how 'either of them can be allowed to *diſobey* 'him, (though yet the *Party* ought to 'have recourſe alſo to *Paſtors* for *Ordination*, and People for *Conſent* where it 'may be done) And *Grotius* commendeth the ſaying of *Muſculus*, *That, he would have no Miniſter queſtion his Call, that being qualified, hath the Chriſtian Magiſtrates Commiſſion.* And though this *Aſſertion* need ſome limitation; yet it is apparent, that the Magiſtrates Power is *great* 'about the *Offices of the Church.*

'For *Solomon*, put out *Abiathar* from the 'Prieſt-hood, and put *Zadock in his place*, '1 King. 2. 27, 35. *David* and the Cap-

'tains

'tains of the Hoſt, Seperated to *Gods* '*Service*, thoſe of the Sons of *Aſaph* and 'of *Heman* and *Jedu*ther, who ſhould Pro-'pheſie with *Harps*, &c. 1 Chron. 16. 4. 'And ſo did *Solomon*, 2 Chron. 8. 14, 15. 'They were for the Service of the *Houſe* 'of *God*, according to the *Kings Order*, '1 Chron. 25. 1, 6. And methinks thoſe 'thoſe men ſhould acknowledge this, that 'were wont to ſtile the *King*, *in all Cau-*'*ſes and over all Perſons*, *the Supream Head* 'and *Governor*. So far He.

And indeed I durſt almoſt challenge this *Anſwerer*, or any man, to prove; that e-ver any learned *Proteſtant* in this Church, whether *Epiſcopal* or *Presbyterian*, did make it a queſtion, (I mean before the Kings happy Return) whether *Solomon* had not ſufficient Authority to put out *Abiathar* from the Prieſt-hood, and put *Zadock* in his place. Or whether any might modeſtly ſay ſuch *muſt Preach*, and that thoſe were *Schiſmaticks* and *Uſurpers* that did exer-ciſe their Offices according to Law, in the places of *ſuch* as were *removed*, by the Vertue of an *Act of Parliament* of unque-ſtionable Authority, and we *muſt Preach* though the *Law* forbids us.

As for Dr. *Gunnings*, Dr. *Wilds* preach-ing fourteen or fifteen years ago, which you

ſo

ſo often hint at, it is ſufficiently known, it was in ſuch a time, when the *Caſe* was far *otherwiſe*, both with the *Church* and *State*, in many *Notorious Circumſtances*: both as to *Perſons*, *Law*, *Government* and *Worſhip*; and they could eaſily anſwer their ſo doing, if it be not a matter too much *below* the Eminency both of their *Perſons* and *Places*. We muſt proceed:

CHAP. XI.

Proviſion for the proof of the Aſſumption, by four Propoſitions.

THat Schiſm is a *Cauſeleſs* Seperation from a *True* Church: and *what* Seperation from a True Church is, and *when* it is Cauſeleſs, hath at large appeared. And there ſeems nothing left to *prevent* or *remove* the charge of *Schiſm* from the *Practices* we oppoſe, but to plead, either that *our* Churches are no *true* Churches; or that you are not *of them*, and *ow* them no *Communion*; or that you do not *Seperate* from them: or *if* you do, you have *Cauſe ſufficient*, and your Seperation is not *Raſh* or *Groundleſs*.

That the *Contrary* to all theſe, is the *very Truth*, I am now to manifeſt. The *Propoſitions* accordingly, are theſe *four*.

1. *Pro-*

Pro. 1. *That our Parochial Congregations are true Churches.*

2. *That the people of* England *are, or ought to be, members of our Parochial Congregations.*

3. *That the preſent practice of gathering Churches out of them, is Seperation.*

4. *That ſuch Seperation is Raſh, and without juſt grounds.*

And all theſe ſhall be proved, not only from the *Nature* of the things, and the judgment of others: but from the *Publique* judgement of the former *Non-Conformiſts* and *Preſbyterians*; and then I hope my *bold undertaking* will be found *excuſable.*

CHAP. XII.

Parochial Congregations true Churches. His Exceptions, eſpecially about pariſh bounds, examined.

FIrſt, I affirm that *our Parochial Congregations are true Churches.*

They have the *matter* of true Churches. Profeſſed *Chriſtians*, *Baptized.* They have the *form* of true Churches, being *Societies* of ſuch, as *Ames* ſaith, in *order* to the *worſhip* of God: and theſe fix'd and *Stated*, and *ordinarily* aſſembling *actually* together for *that end.*

According to our *Author*, they have, *generally*, *both* the *Essential*, and constituent parts of true Churches; *Pastors* to govern, and *people* to be govern'd by them, in order to Gods glory, and their Salvation.

And as their *end*, so the *means*, and their *work* in their *publick* Assemblies, is *such* as is *proper* and peculiar unto, and *true*, and undoubted *indications* and notes of true Churches; the *Ordinances* of God, and their ordinary *attendance* thereupon, in known, *publique*, and *fixed* places, consecrated, and *set apart* for that end. Wherein, also, there is *nothing practic'd*, much less *allow'd*, that is *contrary* to these *means*, or doth *pervert* that *end*; or with any pretence, or colour of reason, can be thought to *destroy* their *being*, or their *truth*, as *Churches* of *God*.

For this we have *abundant* Suffrage voluntarily given by *Non-Conformity* it self, from time to time, and that not only in the acknowledgement, but even in the *defence* of them against their *enemies* of the *Separation*: and what need more. If Mr. *Ball*, Mr. *Hildersham* of old, and Mr. *Bagshaw*, and his friend, the *Answerer*, be heard for the *rest*.

Mr. *Ball* is express for himself, and his Brethren: 'The Non-Conformists, saith he, 'can not only acknowledg, but prove the Reli-

Religion and *worship* of the *Church of Eng-*
'*land* to be of *God*; not by *pet-*
Anſ. to Can. part. 2. p. 3. '*ty reaſons*, and colourable
'ſhews, (which they leave to
'them which maintain a bad *Cauſe*) but
'by pregnant *evidence from the word of Truth*,
'even by *plain Texts* of Scripture, and *ſound*
'*reaſon* deduced therefrom, againſt which the
'*Gates of Hell* ſhall *never prevail*.

Mr. *Hilderſham* comes not a whit be-
hind him: 'There is nothing
On John 4. p. 3 'done, ſaith he, in Gods *publick*
'*worſhip* among us, but it is done
'by the *Inſtitution*, and *Ordinance*, and *Com-*
'*mandment* of the Lord, as he very induſtriouſly and learnedly proves, by an *enumeration* of the particulars of *our worſhip*, and thence preſſeth the people, not only to attend it, but to *come to the beginning of it*.

Mr. *Bagſhaw* himſelf acknowledgeth the
ſame: And therefore pleads, that
Antidote p. 5. they do not *ſeperate*, but *forbear*
Communion, becauſe of *ſome conditions required*; and ſo indeed doth Doctor *Owen*, and all ſober *Independents*; and therefore I need not obſerve, that thoſe eminent *Presbyterians*, that wrote the *Epiſtle* before Mr. *Balls* Anſwer to *Cann*, did own; or, that Mr. *Cawdry*, and other *Presbyterians*, have

made it the *foundation* of *all* their *Arguments* against *Independent* gathering Churches,' that our *Churches*, *were true Churches*.

Our *Author* doth not so much as *question* the truth of our Churches in *General*: what *exceptions* notwithstanding he hath *scattered* about it, we shall briefly examine.

Object. 1. *Page* 10. He tells us, like an *Oracle*, among the rest of their *Purposes* and *Desires*, which are not a *few*, and they none of the best, that the *Non-Conformists* think, that a *Parish*, *quatenus*, a Parish, is *not a Church*: nor a *Parishioner*, as *such*, *a Church-Member*.

Well, and who ever said they thought *otherwise*? in some things, it seems, they *think*, as *others do*. Yet we *know*, and they ought to *think* at least, that *a Company of Christians living within Parish bounds*, and *ordinarily attending upon Gods publick worship*, in *the place set a part to that end*, are a Church.

Object. 2. But they think also, that *Parish bounds* of Churches are of *Humane prudential Constitution*, and not of *Divine Institution*, or *unchangable*,

But pray think again; for you ought to think, that *co-habitation* of the Members of a

a *Parochial* Church is according to the *Law of Nature*, and ſo *Divine*: and that perſons, whom Providence hath ſo placed together, are bound to *worſhip God together* in ſome *publick* way; by vertue of the Law of *Natural Religion*, as much as *Families* among themſelves; were there *no other inſtitution* of *God* or *man* in the caſe.

Moreover, they ought to think, that *cohabitation* of Church members is ſo far of *Divine Inſtitution*, as the *Examples* of Churches in *Scripture*, alwaies ſo bounded, amount to *Divine Inſtitution*. Which is almoſt as much, as is *uſually* urged for the *Divine Inſtitution of the Lords day* This was the current Argument of the *Presbyterians* heretofore, againſt the attempts of *Independents* to *break* theſe bounds, and to *glean* up members in *others fields*, no matter what diſtance, to make up their *Churches*. *Churches and Cities in the Scripture, are commenſurate.* Was not the Church of *Jeruſalem* and *Corinth*, ſo called from the places.

Cawdrey Schyſ. pag.

They ought, further to *think*, that the *grounds* of ſuch *parochial* Churches, were laid in *Reaſon*, and *Scripture examples*: though *Ours* were *actually divided*, long ſince: and that our *Pariſh bounds*, in the general *intention* and ſcope of thoſe that firſt

appointed them; notwithstanding *some errors* which will alwayes happen in such publick cases) were made, upon the said *reasonable* and *Scripture* ground of *co-habitation.*

They ought, also, to *think*, that though *Prudence* at first, discerned these *grounds*, and accordingly set these *bounds* of parish Churches; yet, it was not the prudence of the *People*, but their *Governours*: who have not now left it in the *peoples liberty* or *prudence*, whether they will ordinarily *keep these bounds* or not. But have also bounded that *vulgar extravagancy* by the *Laws* both of *Church* and *State* to the contrary.

Yet again, they ought to *think*, that they owe *obedience* to their *Governors* in *these laws*; which *obedience* is certainly of *Divine Institution*, though I can hardly *find* it in *all your Books.*

You ought, lastly, to *think*, of the *fearfull consequences* of *tearing* these hedges and *ancient bounds*, and thereby making *inlets*, or *outlets*, or *both*, to all kind of *licentiousness* in Religion, and *confusion* in the Church; while you thus expose *parochial Congregations* to the *directest* means of their *dissolution.*

O that you would lay to heart those *serious* words of Mr. *Baxter*, The *Interest* of the

the Christian Protestant Religion in England *must be kept up, by keeping up as much of Truth, Piety, and Reputation, as is possible in the parish Churches.* his Defence of his Cure p. 36.

For the *last* word, that *parish bounds* are not *unchangeable*, 'tis acknowledged; if the cause be *just* and *Covent-garden* be not *Schysmatical*, yet still the *Rule of co-habitation* ought to be observed; and then our design is half spoiled. Especially if we add, as we needs must, that this *changing* or alteration of *parish bounds*, lies not in the pleasure of *private Persons*: is not to be attempted without the *order* of Superiours, nor to the prejudice of *Gods-publick worship*: wherein, if all *order* be not quite forgotten, the *practice* of the people should not ordinarily *exceed*, that which the known *Union* and *Communion* of Parishes, in the same Worship and Government, and the *common Custome*, and consequently *Allowance*, of the *places* intended, will warrant: wherein *London*, perhaps, if what you say be true, may claim some priviledge.

p. 35. He saith, he doth allow our *parochial Churches* to be *true Churches*, viz. *Those of them that have true Ministers, otherwise not.* So that where there are *no* Ministers, and where their Minister is not

true; there the *Parishes are not Churches.*

Tis likely some few small places, especially *Cures*, have no *setled* Ministers, but the *Law* requires their Communion with their *Mother-Church*, of which, in a sence, they are reckoned *Members*, if they are *Curacies.*

And I hope there are fewer *false Ministers* than your *charity* supposeth. *How far* the people are bound to communicate with such as you call *intollerable*, shall be examined in the next Chapter.

But if this be all to be found at the bottom of your exceptions, as it seems to be, why do not *your Brethren, confine their labour to such destitute places*; especially, if *this* be the *great* reason why they *must preach.* At least their Charity should see them *first provided* for. Sure their voices will hardly reach to them from *Cities*, and *Corporations*, and places usually furnisht well enough without them, though here they generally *pitch* their *Tabernacle:* you and they must think again and again, before you will be able to defend *these practices* upon *such principles.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

The People of England, *Members of Parochial Churches. Objections answered. Especially that, from serving God better.*

THe *People of* England, *generally are, or ought to be (Members or Ministers) of our parochial Churches*, and consequently are bound to atttend upon the *publick worship* of God in our Temples.

Ordinarily: I mean, I am not so strict to think, that they ought *never to be absent*, if they have *reason*, as the *Statute* intimates: or, that they may *never* go out of their own Parishes to hear a *Sermon:* provided alwayes they keep within the *bounds* of that *latitude*, which the *Communion* of *Parish-Churches*, and the *custom* of the place, as in *London*, if it be so there, as our *Answerer* affirms, will warant, as I said before.

But that *generally*, the people are of the *Parishes Churches* and *ordinarily* ought to communicate *with them*, there is hardly any thing more evident in *reason* or *sence*, and the judgement of the *Non-Conformists*.

For they were *baptized* into these *particular* Churches, as well as into the *universal*; and the known *Laws*, both of Church and State, *oblige*

eblige their Conſciences, to Communion with them. Beſides, if they be not of the *particular* Church wherein they live, they are of *none*: but their *ordinary attending* upon the publique worſhip as they generally doe, or have done, concludes them by their own *conſent* to ſay nothing now, of the *inconveniencies* that follow *ſeparation* from them; an Argument not to be deſpiſed till it be better conſidered and cenſured.

Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaks very well and *home* to the point thus: 'He that is a Member of the *univerſal* Church, is fit to 'be received into a *particular* Church; and there wanteth no more but *Mutual conſent*: and if he 'have ſtatedly joined with a *particular* 'Church, in *ordinary Communion*, *Conſent* hath been manifeſted, and he is a *Member* of *that particular* Church — Thus in *Theſi*.

Cure of Ch. div. p. 89.

'Then he ſubjoines; *This is the common caſe in England*, the perſons who were bap-'tized in Infancy, were, at once, received 'into the *Univerſal* Church, and into ſome 'particular Church, and have held *Commu-'nion at Age* with *both*, &c.

In a caſe ſo plain, in the writings of the *Old Non-Conformiſts*, I ſhall only give you Mr. *Baxters* Teſtimony for them all, eſpe-

cially

cially finding an *Emphasis* in his words, which are *these*.

'Speaking to his Brethren, saith he, much more should you have endured such, as the *Non-Conformists* of that age who used *Parish Communion* and 'pleaded for it, against the *Seperatists*, 'far Sharper language than ever I used, 'as their Books against *Johnson* and *Cann* 'and *Brown*, and *Ainsworth*, do yet visibly 'declare.

Defence of his cure p. 14.

Hence, it is, that worthy Non Conformist Mr, *Hildersham*, doth not only Judg it *Lawful*, and a *Duty* to attend upon the Parish *Congregation*, but useth many Arguments against the *Ordinary* leaving our own Ministers, to hear *more able men* in other *Parishes*: and for our coming *reverently* and at the *beginning* of the Service.

upon the fourth of John.

And Mr. *Baxter* perswadeth with *many Arguments* to Communion with the *Parish Churches* which he would *not* have done, if he had not thought it, not only to be Lawful, but a *Duty*, yea he saies expresly, that to some it is a Duty to joine with some *Parish Churches, in the Lords Supper three times a year*, Defence of his Cure, *f.* 3^c. which he saith, he proved by twenty Reasons, and by his own *example* avow'd in *publique*, and his

his constant *resolution* so to do, he adds much *weight* to his *said reasons*.

And to give my *Answerer* his due, *in* this, as he doth not deny the *truth* of most of our Churches, so he doth much perswade, both by *reason* and his own *example*, to *communion with them*, and therefore he believeth (as I believe of him) that it is a *duty*.

Ind Schyf. pag. 143. But for the *Presbyterians* and their judgement in the point before 1660; let Mr. *Cawdrey* be heard at large.

Speaking against the *Independants* seperation, saith he, 'If they did not suppose themselves to be of some *particular* Church, it 'was their *Errour* and their *Fault*; their '*Errour* because all the people of the *Nation*, 'were confin'd to *that Church*, where they 'lived; and liable to *censure* for leaving that 'Church, for partaking of Ordinances; and the Ministers for admitting them: their '*fault*, because they were bound by way of 'duty, both by the Laws of the Nation, and 'also by the Law of God, to be of one or other *particular* Congregation; meaning '*parochial*.

Object. pag. 41. But what saith our *Answerer* against all this? he yieldeth much no doubt, where he saith, the *old Non-Conformist*

miſts hold Lay communion with Pariſh Churches lawful: and *ſo do we.* But did not they alſo hold it a *duty*: prove the *contrary* if you can. I challenge him to ſhew in *any of them*, one word ſignifying it *lawful*, to *hold Communion with any other ſtated Church in England*, beſides the *parochial*, or that, ever they *preach'd* in *houſes*, as you *unfairly* intimate, when the people ſhould be in the *pariſh Church*; or, that any learned *Presbyterian* ſaid ſo, before 1660: if not, what ſignifies all your *new-coined diſtinctions*, *pag.* 34, 35.

Anſw.

Object. But in *ſome places*, we cannot *profit* by the Miniſter.

Anſw. You may profit by the *prayers*, and *Sacraments*. The *old Non-Conformiſts* will not indure the *objection*, againſt *all*, or againſt *any* weak, if *honeſt* Miniſter. Let Mr. *Hildersham*'s reaſons againſt it be examin'd: ſaith he, *Our Shame, our Sin, and juſt cauſe of humbling to us, if we cannot profit by the meaneſt Miniſter that God hath ſent. And the power of the Miniſtry dependeth not on the excellency of the Teachers gifts, but upon Gods bleſſing: though ſometimes he thinks people may go to hear other Miniſters of better gifts.*

On John 4. p 225, 226.

Object. But ſome Miniſters are *intollerable.*

Anſw.

Answ. I grant the *Non-Conformists*, and particularly Mr. *Hildersham*, do *allow* the people, in such cases, to go from their own *Parish*; yet he puts in three Rules to the Case, that it be done without *open breach* or contempt to the Churches *Order*, without contempt of their *own Pastors*, and without *Scandal* and offence to *them* and their *people*.

But if no Ministers be *intollerable*, but such as our *Answerer* describes to be so, *I* hope, there are but *few* such in *our dayes*; what ever there were in Mr. *Hildershams* time.

Advice. 'By Intollerable, saith he, I mean 1. 'Such as are *ignorant* of, or *erroneous* against the *Essentials* of Christianity. 2. Such as are *unable* to teach them others. 3. Such as *malignantly* preach down 'the *practice of an Holy life*, or in a word, 'such whose Ministery really tendeth to do 'more *hurt* than *Good*.

There are Intollerable indeed, and if there should chance to be found *one or two such* within a Province (I hope not so many,) sure, some *duty* we owe concerning them. But what's that? in the first place, we are certainly bound to endeavour his *amendment* if that be not to be done, but he be found *incurable*, he is the more *intollerable*, and our

next

next duty to endeavour to *remove him.*

Cure of Ch. div p 106. So for Mr. *Baxter's* advice is wholsome and appoſite; *uſe all your diligence to amend him: and if you cannot do that, uſe all your intereſt to get him out, and get a better, indeed* he adds, *if you cannot do that, deliver your own ſoul from him by removing to a better, if you are free:* he means, *if you are not under the command of others, remove to another Pariſh, which none can except againſt.*

But all this while there is no room made for *Seperation*: the *Non-Conformiſts* never allowed this, the Holy *Scriptures* as Mr. *Baxter* tells us, has *not a word to that purpoſe.*

Obj. But we are troubled again with his *laſt refuge*, which attempts us every where, your Churches are allowed; and communion with them, when we have no *opportunity to do better:* but to ſerve God better, we may *leave* your *Churches* and gather *others.*

Anſw. This hath *pirkt* up to my trouble two or three times already; I will now give it ſuch a blow as I hope to hear on't no more.

1. If we may not *refuſe* Communion with our own *particular* Church, while

while we can do it *without sin:* the only condition allowed, by all that were pure *Non-Conformists*; yea, and by the very *Brownists* themselves, then this pretence is *vaine*. But you *grant* you may *continue* such Communion with the *Parish without* sin, by the tenour of the *Objection*.

2. This Objection, extends not only to the change of the *Minister*, but of the very *Worship*, the *publique places* of assembling, and the *parochial bounds* of Churches: which as in the *nature* and consequence of the things themselves are very *dangerous*, so they were all quite *contrary* to the *reason* and *practise* of former *Non-Conformists*. They might think, they had reason sometimes to *do better*, but they never meant it, in any way contrary to the *publique Worship*, and Assemblies; but only in some other *Parish Church*.

3. 'Tis in effect the same excuse that the *Brownists* had for their *seperation*, only, not quite so *considerable*,; they complained things were *bad*; and you would have them *better*; and therefore *seperate*, as *they* did.

4. The very same plea, that the *Independents* used in other words, *more plausable* to their purpose. Namely, pretence of disorders in the Church, and pretence of *reformation*, and yet more neer to the present pre-

pretence, that they might worſhip with *purer worſhip*, all which Mr. *Cawdry*, the *Patron of Presbytery*, hath taken notice of and anſwered to *Dr. Owen*. Boldly *appealing* the Dr. in the point, as I do my *Anſwerer* in *his words*.

Indep fur-ther p 142. I leave it to his own conſideration, whether it be lawful 'for 'people that are Members of 'true Churches as ours are acknowledged to 'be. . Upon ſome diſorders in a Church, 'or pretence of Reforming themſelves, to 'ſeparate from that Church and to erect a-'nother: when as they have done their du-'ty to reform it, in thoſe diſorders, not-'withſtanding which they may without Sin 'Communicate with that Church? But ra-'ther to break true Churches into peices, 'than to bear with ſome inconveniencies, 'and I deſire a preſident of ſuch a practice 'in Scripture or Story, and as he ſaith ſo 'do I.

But the pretence of worſhiping God *better*, and therefore they may gather a *purer Church*, out of a *true Church* the *Presbyterian* ſeems to deride it as not worthy a ſerious conſideration or anſwer is there ſaith he, any *inſtitution of Chriſt, that they muſt gather members out of true Churches to make a purer Church, if ſo it be?*

Ind Schy: p. 198.

4. But the *Sting* is in the *Tail*, gathering Churches out of our *Parishes*, that they may *serve God better*, is an *intollerable principle* and *practice*; it plainly puts *Raines* into the *peoples* hands, to *Govern* and *reform themselves*, without their *Bishops* or *Pastors*: which, me-thinks, Mr. *Baxter* should not like very well; and without the *Civil-Magistrate*, which the *Presbyterians* could not endure.

To *Reform themselves*, I say, without the order of any kind of *Governors*, not only in one *single* Parish, but throughout the *Kingdome*: nor only to reform abuses in *Administrations* but in the *worship* and *Government*, yea even to the utter *dissolution of our Church-state*, and the *bounds* and *places* of our Parochial congregations, & the setting up of other *Churches*, other *Ministers*, and another *Worship* and *Government* throughout the Kingdome; so far as this Rule takes.

For the Rule, in its *practical Nature* and use, is *general*. And if it be the duty of *one*, it is the duty of *another* and of *all*, to worship *God better* in this *new way*; and consequently, *all* are bound to worship *God better*; and all must joine in these *new Congregations* while the *Bishops* and *Ministers* and *Temples* are left useless, and there is no way which our *Author* can think of, to prevent & stop this

deluge

deluge but the peoples *prudence*: and how likely that is to do it, let the wise consider. Was ever *Non-Conformist* or *Presbyterian* before, of this opinion or any one that was not a *down-right Seperatist*?

Dr. *Owen*, having said, that, if a man cannot prevail to have the Church *reformed*, he may dispose of himself, as to particular *Church Communion*, to his best advantage: one would think this was *modestly* spoken in comparison, yet observe how the *Presbyterian* takes him up.

Ind. Schyf. p 189,190.

'This is *liberality* enough, and '*Dictator-like* spoken, does not 'this open a door to all *confusion* 'in *Church and State*? And give every man 'as well as any, *liberty*, if they judge any 'thing amiss in Church or State, to *turn* 'Reformers, if *Superiors* cannot, or will not 'reform it?

'In a State or *National* Church, as that 'of the *Jews*; was it lawful for a *few men*, 'when State and Church were all *corrupted*, 'to go and reform *both*, because they that 'had the *power* in their hand, either *could* 'not or *would* not reform? I think I may 'safely say, this is *an Anabaptistical* 'Munster principle at the bottom. So he,

Besides, the rule hath run equally in it, against the *Reformers* themselves, every

Sect will plead the *same* liberty to serve *God better*, and as Mr. *Baxter* hath well *Item'd* you, *Separation will ruine the Separated Churches themselves*, (and not at all varie from their own light by which they ascended unto separation) it *will admit of no consisteney: parties will arise in the separated Churches, and separate again from them till they are dissolved, as experience witnesseth.*

Defence of Cure. p. 50,

But because, my *Author* speaks of *gathering Churches* for the first *three hundred years* after Christ, I shall not disturb him by enquiring *out of what Churches* they were gathered, only shall give him a *Presbiterians* expostulation, and conclude this Chapter.

Cawd. Indep. further p. 141,

'Will he call that a *peaceable proceeding* 'which is done without the Authority of the *Christian Civil Magistrate*: and to the disturbance of all the Churches of the *Nation.*

'Were it granted, that in the *first Constitution* of a Church people might by their own '*free Consent*, join to walk together, &c: is 'this course *tollerable* in *setled* Churches, to 'the confusion and overthrow of the very *Constitution* of our Churches?

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

The preſent practice plain ſeparation, Objections by the Anſwerer conſidered.

THe preſent practice of gathering Churches out of our Churches is ſeparation.

Though our Churches are *true* Churches: and the *perſons* concerned are or ought to be *Members* of them; yet do they *properly ſeparate* from them.

This is matter of *Fact* evident *in it ſelf*, and to the ſences of too many *ocular Witneſſes*.

1. They diſlike, or *diſtaſt*, our *Parochial Communion*: ſome, as *Antichriſtian*; ſome, as *corrupt*; ſome, as *defective*; and not *ſo good*, as they would have it; and ſome, perhaps, becauſe they like not our *Miniſters*: and ſome, as he intimates for Communion, with their *old ejected* Paſtors, what their *ſeveral* reaſons are, (for they are far from being all of a mind, as he acknowledgeth) we can but *gueſs*, but they do all *diſlike* our Communion at leaſt, *comparatively* none can *deny* or *doubt* this.

2. Upon this *diſlike*, Whatever the cauſe of it be, they do plainly *forſake* our *Pariſh-Churches*, and publique worſhip. Now, we do not ſay, that *non-Actual Communion*, is properly *Separation*: yet all men ſay, that a *renouncing Communion*, or *denying* to Communicate with any Church, much more *our own*, upon any *diſlike*, or for any cauſe, *except ſin*, is properly *Separation* and ſchyſm: it is not *actually not communicating with a true Church*, but *renouncing Communion*, *that*, *we think*, *makes* the Shyſmatick, 'tis this, in which *Ameſius* himſelf placeth the very *formality* of Schyſm.

In l. Schyſ. p. 188.

Am. de Schyſ.

Schyſm is directly a *breach of unity*; as *that* is a breach of *charity*, *refuſing* to Communicate with a true Church, when I have *opportunity*; eſpecially, my *own Church*; is a plain breach of *both*: what ever my *reaſon* be, ſhort of *Sin*.

3. But *thirdly*, they *perfect* their Schyſm and ſeparation, by *gathering themſelves* into *other Congregations* under other *Miniſters*, and for *another mode* of *Worſhip* than is allowed by our Church and *Lawes*; and thus become *Anti-churches*, and to make this new *Church-State*, as oppoſite to ours, as may be, they *generally*, meet at the *ſame*

ſame time that we do: & that, not only where the Pariſhes are *ſuſpected*, defective in *parts*, *gifts*, *graces* or *Adminiſtrations*: much leſs intollerable, or where there are *none* at all, as was noted before, and in ſuch places as they ſuppoſe to be ſo *ill* provided: for we hear nothing of their *charity*, but in places, where neither theſe Miniſters nor their *followers* have the leaſt exception to the *Pariſh-Miniſter*.

And thus, they ſeparate, not for *ſometimes* and for ſome ordinances, but *conſtantly*, & for *all* ordinances: the *Word*, *Prayers*, and both *Sacraments*, and that *generally*, in *all* places near us, without any ſuch diſtinction of Miniſter or any thing elſe; ſo that though I have enquired, I can hear but of *one* Miniſter, within a very large compaſs that takes the liberty of *Indulgence*, and doth not *ſo* abuſe it. And I fear, they do ſo generally throughout *England*, if we may gueſs at other places by the practice of theſe: except your good example and advice have a better influence *there*, than here.

For, I cannot but let you know, that your *Canons* are ſo contrary to their *purpoſes* and *practiſes*, that I have ſome reaſon to believe, that our new *Church gatherers* here about are generally as much *diſpleaſed* with the *rules* whereby you would bound their *ex.ravagant*

gant practises, as they seem to be *pleased* with your *Magisterialness over me*,

And, by the way, give me leave to tell you, that *two things* especially, *I* cannot take well at your hands. 1. That you would insinuate that such as call themselves *Presbyterians*, which you say, are *not so*, you *shuffle* them amongst the rest of the *Sects*, which are for *gathering of Churches*. 2. That you intimate, you knew *their minds*, and that they would not *separate* and gather Churches in the manner we see, by sad experience they generally do

For, *I* do acknowledge you sufficiently discover, your *own Inclination*, hopes, and desires are *otherwise* than we find their *practises*: yea, you seem to intimate their practises to be otherwise: they have deceived *you*; as indeed, you did *me*: who am sorry to find your pen imployed for the *Countenance*, to say no more of *Separation* and Schysm in the *highest* measure that this poor Church ever yet experimented.

Why do *I* hear *words* to excuse and alleviate the Matter; when their deeds declare the quite contrary to what you hope and intimate? all your *propositions* and purposes, can never make them either *not* Presbiterians or *Seperatists*, unless, by their quitting their former principles, they are sunk into the numb.r

number of *Independents*: for it is hard to say *which* of the Congregations is most *Congregational*.

Obj You seem to wonder, *p.* 40. that I charged not your *preaching* before your *indulgence*, with *Schysm* as well as now.

Answ. No doubt, if it were so *before*, as we see it is since, I might yet venture to do it, but, Sir, let me tell you something, that I know will not be easie to you. In the *City* where *I* am a Preacher, there might, perhaps *thirty* or *forty ordinarily meet* by *stealth*, and perhaps not at the same time of our *publique* worship, whereas, there are now *six* or *seaven allowed places*; and perhaps, they may share three thousand of our Members among them; that now, so far as we can judge, *totally separate*: yet *I* think never any one of them complained of the *inability*, *infidelity*, or *scandal* of the *Parish-Ministers*. Now when we see *such* a *Torrent* preparing to bear down all *our Churches*, *I* think, it is time to speak, *I* would *deliver my own soul*, if *I* cannot save the Church from the evil begun.

Speak in earnest, Sir, if the matter be thus indeed, is it not *separation* with a *Witness* if you will not, let others speak.

Cawd. Indep. p. 161. 162. The *old Rule was the sincere preaching of the Word*, and right

right Administration of Sacraments are the Characters of a *true Church, which we having, and they separating from us, how shall this Crime be named, but by Schysm in the highest degree.*

And *the rather does this relate to Schysm, in gathering Churches. p.* 180. *Because they do not only depart themselves, but draw off others also into a formed Faction.*

CHAP. XV.

The present practice of Separation and gathering Churches is causeless and unwarantable. Objections of the Answerer considered.

BEcause, it is *Separation* from *true* Churches, by *such* as are, or ought to be *Members*, of those true Churches; both *negatively*, and *positively*, and *totally* so; and lastly, which only *remains* to be proved, because it is both *Rash* and *Unjust*, and without sufficient grounds of offence given by these Churches.

For it hath already appeared that such separation is *sinful* and Schysm, in the worst sence of the word, when it is *Rash* or *Unjust*, without such grounds; it only remains to be shew'n, that the *present practise*

ſiſe aforeſaid, is both *Raſh* and *Unjuſt*.

1. First, it is, apparently a *Raſh* Separation; for thoſe that go from us, to theſe *new Churches* could not *foreſee*, or reaſonably imagine *this Liberty* now indulged, a *Week*, (if a *day*) before the *Declaration* was publiſh't.

And how *ſuddenly*, they did upon it, prepare for the work, and ſeparate to their new *Congregations* and *Guides*, 'tis too well known to inſiſt on: and where is the man (if one ſuch there be, let him come forth to own it) that adviſed with his *Pariſh-Miniſter* about his *departure*, or was ſo civil to *take his leave*; much leſs, ſhew'd him any *juſt occaſion* of his ſo ſudden reſolution; or what gave him the *offence* in the *perſon* or *Adminiſtration* of his paſtor; or in the *Worſhip* and Communion or *Converſation* of his *fellow Members*, and moved or diſpoſed him thereunto, before he did *Actually* ſeperate. Much leſs did he exerciſe any *patience* or *long-ſuffering*, in order to his own *Satisfaction* or the *Reformation* of the Church (of which he was a *member*) in what he thought *amiſs*.

If *ſuch* ſeparation is not *Raſh* and ſudden, if it fail not in the *due manner* of proceeding, ſhew your *Reaſon*, or elſe bear the *Cenſure* and charge of *Schyſm*, from all ſound and judicious

judicious *Casuists*, let the pretence or *cause* otherwise, be never so *great* and *just*.

Indeed, they generally gave up themselves, with all manner of dilligence, to obtain their *Licenses*: to contrive their *Houses*; to appoint their *meetings*: *conspiring* in this, as appears by their practice, that they would hold their *Assemblies*, at the same hour with the *parochial*; the directest method they could imagine, to be *opposite* to us, yet, not so well considering, what might be the *consequences*; as one of the *sobberest* of their Ministers complained, who observed it *too late*, which had they had *patience* and wisdome, first to have consulted my *Answerer*, might in all likelyhood, in *many places*, at least have been happily prevented.

2. But, Alas! this is not the Burthen of *Ephraim*; their separation fails in the *foundation* and grounds of it, it is not *accountable*, upon any terms of *Charity*, *Justice*, or *Christian sobriety*: strictly, the *Churches*, from which they seperate, hath not given them any *such offence*, or cause of offence sufficient, to *justifie* their seperation, either in *truth* or in the judgment of any, but *themselves*: much less, the old *Non-Conformists* and *Presbyterians*; as will soon appear in full light.

Our

Our *Answerer* hath set you a *hard Game* to play, here; for you must shew us *such reason* why you leave us, as will *excuse* you from *seperation*, and yet justifie your *gathered Churches*.

Which, upon the suppositions already proved; that our Churches are true Churches; that you are or ought to be members of them, and to continue in Communion with them, while you live in them, if we have given you no *just* occasion to discontinue it, seems to be a plain contradiction and your *New Churches* are no better than *stated seperations*.

But, laying aside all little insignificant *Artifices* and *modern* evasions, the *question* in short is *this*. Whether *we can have any just plea for seperation from any Church of which we are members, while we may communicate with it, without communion in sin*. The *negative* hath appeared, all set *parties* have subscribed the negative: and hardly any but *your selves*, ever question'd it, if yet *you* do so.

The *Protestants* by the *Papists*, the *Brownists* by the *Puritans*; the *Anabaptist*, *Independent*, and *Interpendent*, by the *Presbyterian*, are all charged with *Shysm*; and all without scruple, put their controversies to *this Issue*; if you that charge us with *Schysm*, can prove that

that we may hold Communion with you without *sinning*, we acknowledge the charge, therefore they allwaies defend their *seperation*, by chargeing *sin* upon their *Communion* from whom they separated also. On the *other* hand, they endeavoured to make the charge of Schysm upon those that seperated, by answering the *objections* of *Sin*, against their *several* Communions, so that on all sides, this sense of *Schysm*, passed *uncontrolled*; and was never *I* think disputed or doubted *before*, if it be so now, and Dr. *Ames* hath put it into the very *Definition* of Schysm: and makes it his great *Rule*, by which he answers the *Cases* about it.

But, to prevent mistakes, *I* must speak with *Caution*; by *discontinuing* Communion, *I* do not mean; only a not having *Actual* Communion with the Church, for that may be *involuntary*, as when a man is *excommunicated*; or *necessitated* by *sickness*, or if you will have it added, by *too great a multitude* of members: yea, it may chance to be *voluntary*, yet not properly *Schysm*, when we do not attend *Gods worship*, through *neglect* of our *Duty*, and a *prophane* principle: but of these we speak not here.

By *discontinuing* our Communion, *I* mean, a *denying* or refusing Communion with our own Church upon any *dislike* or distaste of its

its *Worſhip*, or *Miniſter*, or *Members*. Now whether this diſtaſte ariſe from fear of *Communicating in ſin*, where there is no *juſt cauſe* of, or without ſuch *fear*; ſuch *refuſing* or denying Communion is *Schyſm*, yea, as *Ames* adviſeth, if there be *real* evil in ſome part of *Communion* in a true Church, to depart *farther* from it, then *that evil* requires, is *Schyſm*. So when there is no *real* or *pretended* ſinfulneſs in the Communion of our Church, and yet, we take *diſlike* and *ſeperate*, and *totally* ſeperate, and gather our ſelves into *new Congregations* in oppoſition thereunto, who dare ſay, this is no *Schyſm?*

'Tis not worth the queſtion, though you ſomewhere make it, whether *it be Schyſm to remove our dwelling from one Pariſh to another?* Our *civil neceſſities may force* us to it. we hold no ſuch Matrimony, between *Paſtor* and *People*, as ſome talk of: but upon *fair* occaſion, *either* may remove. All *Pariſhes* are in Communion together, and are of the general *Conſtitution* of the Church of *England*: by ſuch a removal, you become a member of *another Pariſh* Church, and are *bound* by the Laws of the Land, and by the Rule of *cohabitation* of membership to hold Communion with the Church in which *you live*, you have ſtill *real* Communion with the

the former Church, not only in the *substance*, but *mode* of its Worship, and its very *Constitution*: but by removing to these *New* Churches, you do not, you cannot *cease* to be of a *Parish* at all, nor of a *Parochial* Church, without *Schysm* from the Church in which *you live*; and from *all* the *Parochial* Churches in *England*; and from the *Church* of *England* it self. I mean, unless you can prove that something is required in our way of Worship that you cannot joyn in *without sinning*.

The question is, to bring the point home, *what sin is to be found in our Worship, wherein the people that joyn with us, must needs Communicate?* If none can be found we must write *Schysm* upon your seperation and we cannot help it.

Use no *delatory pleas*: blind us not with *wide* discourses about what is *fit* to be *imposed*, in order to *peace*, *&c.* and about the *duty* of *Superiors*, that concern *you not*, or about the *hard conditions of Conformity* upon Ministers, as such: we are speaking of *Lay-Communion*, wherein all that are not in the place of *Ministers* are to look to their *Duty*. And if there be any thing required of them, in order to their Communion with us, that is indeed *sinful*, say what is it, and speak to the point.

In

In this Case (Sir) be *Judge* your self, you *expresly* acknowledge, that our *Worship is not such as no man may lawfully Communicate in:* then, certainly you believe, that there is nothing in it, that is really and *materialy evil*, or evil in it self; for then no man might lawfully joyn in it: but if it should become *evil accidentally*, from the *particular* condition of any private man, let him *remove* that evil, and not commit a greater by *Seperation*.

But pray (Sir) why do you seem thus to *limit* your *kindness* and charity to our Communion? if it be not *such* as *no man*, why is it not *such* as *all men*, may *lawfuly* Communicate in? If you may lawfully Communicate in *some* of our Churches (as in another place you speak) why not in *all?* or why do you leave the people in such *distractions?* have not *all* our Churches the same *Ordinances?* our *Ministers* the same *orders?* have they not all the same *matter*, and the very same *Mode* of *Worship?* you do not think the *worth* of the *Minister* goes into the *lawfulness* of our *prayers* and *Sacraments:* or that we may not joyn with the *Liturgie* that is not *seconded* with a *good Sermon*, I am sure you lay not the weight of your limitation upon the *manners* of the people; that's a *principle* you seem to *abhor:* neither can

you make use of any exception against the *Diocesan Church*, where in *all* our Churches are equally concerned, except a few *peculiars*. I am sorry, to say I know not *what you mean* until you better *explain* your self, give me leave to understand you *indefinitely*, especially while you say, you *do* & *will* hold Communion with our own *Parish-Churches your self*, and that you make it your *business* to advise and *perswade others* also, thereunto, which I am very certain you would *not do*, if you did not believe, not only, that our way of Worship is *Lawful i. e.* not sinful, but also, *Good*; and that they in duty ought to *attend* it and Communicate with us, in it.

But, pray Sir, Why then do you *p.* 34. intimate, as if *some Parish-Churches* did *impose some things which God forbids?* Indeed, when you speak seriously, you seem to reduce all the *peoples exceptions* in this kind, to the two known heads; *kneeling* at the Communion, and the *Cross* at Baptism.

1. For *kneeling*, you your self seem not only to *allow*, but to approve it, you also *practise* it and you know, Mr. *Baxter* speaks *handsomely* for it, in his dispute. *p.* 411.

2. For the *Sign* of the *Cross*, made at *Baptism*, *this* indeed is required of the *Minister*

nister; and 'tis his *peculiar* part to do it: and for ought *I* know, it is no more to the *people* than his *wearing the Surpluss*, and if *he* knows it to be his *duty*, why will you deny him his *liberty* to do it. Mr. *Baxter* teacheth us, that in *such* things, we ought to be *guided by our Pastors*, which is *certainly required*; while they are only *suspected*, or at least they are not so *certain*, that they are *sinful*; as we are *certain*, that we ought to *obey*, as he reasons well.

Disput. 484.

Especially, Signing with this *Signe*, being the Ministers *own Act*, you may venture to give him so much *power*, as to do it, without *offence* to you, or, so *great* offence, as to *cause* you to *seperate*. Besides, if you cannot be perswaded to like this *one Action*, yet you must remember the Rule of *Ames*, and seperate for this, in *nothing else* but what needs all this trouble? you have known a way this *ten years*, to answer this *scruple*, by *private Baptisms*: and you will know, how to *serve your selves*, in this of the *Kings Declaration* without my *advice* but then, why should you *seperate*, or gather into *new Churches*, for that, which the *Declaration* removes without *such* doings? why do you *stun* and distract the Church, by *killing a Gnat* upon her *forehead*, with so *great a stroke*.

Sir, you intimate, *p.* 35. the *Case is altered*: but surely, not much as to this point, betwixt us and the *old Non-Conformists*, yet you well know, *all* conformed with the *people* in, and *contended* for *Lay Communion*, against the *Brownists*, yea, it is a worthy observation of Mr. *Baxter*, that if there be any alteration, 'tis for the *better* for the people, as he ingeniously confesseth and accounts. Take his words at large.

Defence of Cure of ch. div. p. 55. Though, saith he, *Ministerial Conformity* be to us *another* thing, (by reason of the *new impositions*) 'than it was to our *predecessors*, yet, 'to the people *Conformity* is the same, if not *easier* (especially to them that *I* now speak 'to) for it is the Lyturgy, Ceremonies, and 'Ministry that most alienate them—and the 'Lyturgy is a little *amended* as to them, by 'the change of the Translation, and some 'little words, and by some longer Prayers, 'and the *Ceremonies* are the same. And thirty years ago, there were *many bare Reading*, not preaching Ministers, for *one* that 'there is *now*: therefore, our case of *Separation* being the same, with that it was of 'old, *I* take it to be fully confuted by the 'Antient Non-Conformists.

'And *I* have so great a veneration for the

'the worthy *Names* (much more an eſtima-
'tion of the *reaſonings*) of Mr. *Cartwright*,
'*Egerton*, *Hilderſham*, *Dod*, *Ameſius*, *Parker*,
'*Bains*, *Brightman*, *Ball*, *Bradſhaw*, *Paget*,
'*Langley*, *Nicols*, *Hering*, and many other
'ſuch, that *I* ſhall not think they knew not
'*why* they choſe this ſubject and wrote
'more againſt Seperation than the *Confor-*
'*miſts* did. Thus he hath given you a full
Jury of old *Non-Conformiſts*, and their *ver-*
dict againſt *Seperation* from our *Parochial*
Congregations, and our preſent way of
worſhipping God: and ſaved me *much la-*
bour in *that particular*.

CHAP. XVI.

Further proof that the practice is Schyſm, by way of Reply to his Objections againſt it.

But for all this, *gathering Churches* is not *Seperation*. Who will ſay ſo beſides? *Re-*
fuſing our Communion, and *gathering them-*
ſelves into *diſtinct* Congregations, I am ſure
was that which the *old Non-Conformiſts*
wrote againſt, and called it *Seperation*, and
though other things occurred by way of Ar-
gument, this was the *main ſcope* and bore
the Burthen of their *Diſputations*.

Besides, you cannot in earnest accuse our Communion *with sin*, and what then can excuse your *leaving* us and gathering *new Churches*, from Seperation: according to the judgment of *all* but *your selves*, the *Seperatists* themselves not excepted, who, never that *I* ever heard of, ventured to question the *major* proposition of this Argument, but denied the *minor*.

Those which seperate from a true Church in whose Communion is nothing sinful, are guilty of Schysm.

But you seperate from a true Church in whose Communion there is nothing sinful.

Therefore you are guilty of Schysm

For all this, *we may gather Churches* and be neither *Shysmaticks* nor *Seperatists*, and we have eight *Reasons* to prove it, a whole cluster of them: we shall try their weight, especially, seeing they would *bear* us down in a point contrary to the sence of all mankind; for new reasons are not alwaies *best*.

But they are clung together so that we take seven of them at once, or they are spoiled.

1. The *Non-Conformists*, though they *gather Churches* are no *seperatists*: for they will not *pronounce any of your Parish-Churches*

ches Null, which have lawful Miniſters: not *Null* by any means, but they will make them as *void* as they can.

2. They will not ſay, that your *Worſhip* is ſuch, as no *man may lawfully communicate in*. We are beholding to you, perhaps *one* or *two* in a *Nation*, ſcarce in a *Pariſh*, by your good will. 3. They ſhall hold that *Pariſh bounds* are *very convenient*: they ſtill hold this, what ever elſe they have let ſlip——— and none *ordinarily*, but *Pariſhoners*, to be of the Church: but what Church do you mean? the *old* or *new*, none of the Pariſh, if they can help it ſhall be of the *old*, and as many *out* of the Pariſh, as they can draw in for ought I perceive ſhall be of the *new*. 4. They are driven from the *Pariſh-Miniſtry* againſt their *Wills*: and had rather hold their *Ancient ſtations*, & they will thankfully return when they have *leave*. But muſt they therefore break *ancient bounds* and ſpoil the *Pariſhes to which* they would return? and after they have taught the people to go aſtray, they are not ſure they will return with a whiſtle. 7. they ſet not up the Church-*Government* of the *people* over the *Paſtors*, but they diſſolve the government of the *Parochial* and *Epiſcopal* Paſtor, and teach the *people* by their *countenancing* of *ſeperation*

ration to despise and *shake off both*. 8. They desire nothing more than as neighbour Ministers —— in love to carry on the same work of Christ with us, and do nothing less.

But what of all this? therefore they are no *seperatists*: how so, because, herein they differ in their *principles* from the old *Seperatists*; what then, if they are the same in that very *practice* that *made* them Seperatists,

I am much of the mind still, that those that are guilty of *sinful seperation* are *seperatists*: and that those that *voluntarily seperate* from a true Church where they may communicate *without sin*, and *gather Churches*, in opppsition thereunto, are guilty of a sinful seperation, do with your reasons what you will.

They may perhaps prove that the *old* Seperatists had some *principles* about these things worse than the *new*: but, under your favour, I think if these seperate as *they* did and think themselves they have not so much to say against our Churches as they of *old* did, their *practise of seperation is the worse* for *this*, and not a whit the *better*. Now give me leave to bring forth my *reason* too. Tis this

If a *great and real* cause of seperation does

does *warrant* and justifie it in *all mens* judgment but *your own*, the *lesser* the cause of seperation is, the *worse* it is, and the more schysmatical; and consequently where there is no *real cause* at all, 'tis *worst* of all.

Therefore, I conceive the *old Non-Conformists*, as well as the late *Presbyterians*, first *charged those* that seperated with the error of the *fact* viz. *Seperation*: and in the second place, upon their reasons given for their *seperation*, from the *Nullity* of our Churches and Ministery, &c. they set themselves upon the proofe and *defence* of them but never took such their *false opinions* to be of the *essence* of their *Seperations*; but only as their *reasons* and excuses for their *evil practises* of Seperations. This ought to be heeded; and then what becomes of your lump of *reasons*? *seaven* of the eight, you see, are *light* and weigh very little, if the *matter* against them be weigh'd also.

But, what think you of the *other reason*, the sixt in number? truely that hath so great a *Smack* of the *old seperation*, and *self-esteem* and admiration of their own way that we *threw* it *away* before as worse then none, when ever it came to our hands; especially in *chapter* 13.

If you suspect us, take it into your hand

hand, as 'tis *wash't* and *rubb'd* and presented to you in the best *manner* the *Author* can set it forth; he saith, they *prefer their own manner of worshiping God as better than the Liturgy in their opinion (no doubt of that) and therefore to be chosen when they may choose* (but who hath given them this liberty! and freed their Consciences from the obligation I know not, though they may sin *unpunisht*) but they account it not the *only acceptable worship*, but are present *with you in spirit, as the great Apostle was with* the corrupt *Corinthians*: but why only in *spirit* and not in *body* I had like to have thought that Communion in *spirit* in a *bad* worship, had been the more *dangerous* of the two,) desiring a part in the prayers of all true Christians in the World, and truely no *more* than *need*, if by *such* practises they seperate allmost from them *all*, and think to be justifyed by such *kind of Reasons*.

But who *tasts* not the *smack of Brownism* and *Donatism* here? for what is the meaning of it but that *our way of worship* is not *so good* as it should be; for certainly, *theirs*, is no *better* than it *should* be; yet they must *leave ours*, to enjoy *their own*, as *better*; our way is therefore, *defective*, if not *Corrupt*. But, wherein is it *defective* more than yours? have

have not we as many *Pſalms* and *Chapters* read, as many *Sacraments* Adminiſtred, as many *Sermons* preached, as you, doth not the *Pariſh Miniſter*, generally pray *before* and *after* Sermon, as well as yours? and have we not the *Common-prayer* over and above? where is our *defect*? away with theſe pitiful ſhews inſtead of *reaſonings*. If we are *corrupt* in our worſhip, ſay *ſo*, if that be the *reaſon* of your ſeperation, *ſay ſo*, and be *Seperatiſts* indeed ſay plainly 'tis a *purer worſhip* and *reformation* that you *leave* us for.

But, let it be what it will, you *your ſelf* think our way *acceptable to* God; you *joine* with us in it; you perſwade *others* to it: ſo that what *defects* or *corruptions* you find in it, cannot *juſtifie* their *ſeperation* from us, in *your opinion*, and I ſee not, how you can avoid *joining* with us in this alſo; and to ſay, they are *Schyſmaticks* for ſo doing. Eſpecially *ſuch* Non-conformiſts, whoſe *Adminiſtrations* you ſuppoſe as bad as the *Liturgy*. p. 16.

But you intimate *one* difference more (for your ſelf *alone*, I ſuppoſe) betwixt *you* and the *Brownijts* in another place, where you ask, *whether ſuch gathered Churches* would *be Schyſmatical if the Common prayer were read in them*? But, what is the reading the

Com-

Common prayer to *Seperation* from the Church? or, why cannot you better hear it in the *Temple*, the *same mode* of worship, is no *excuse*, but an *aggravation* of *division* and seperation; seeing they that *use* it, say they *like it*; and so have no reason from the point *of worship* to forsake our Communion. We have a *Demonstration* from the *Church of Corinth*; who, had all the *same Apostolical* mode of worship, and yet are charged by the *Apostle* himself, with *divisions* and *Schysm*.

Wherefore, though we take it kindly that you are *moderate* in your own *practice*, and let the World and your brethren know it, and propose your advice and example to your brethren so *seasonably* in it, I cannot but a little reflect upon those words of yours *p.* 100.

But. *though I will not bind my self* (take heed of that) *I here tell the World,*——*if opportunity*——*I would sometimes pray freely without forms, and sometimes use some part of the Common Liturgy: and sometime use the Reformed Liturgy, which in* 1600. *was agreed on by Commissioned Non-Conformists, though being done in extream hast, it should be review'd and perfected.*

But why would you not use *all* these at once? then 'tis like *some body* would be *pleased*.

In

In earneſt, muſt the *Liturgy* eſtabliſhed by *Law*, and ſo long *practice*, obtain no more with you, than the *other two* waies mentioned? Speak plain, were the *Non-Conformiſts* then *Commiſſioned for that purpoſe*, to make a *new* Liturgy, as you do more than intimate? Really, me thinks, untill this *new* one be *amended*, you ſhould prefer *our* Liturgy, which was made by as *good* men, and with *leſs haſte*, and more deliberation.

But you may have ſome *peculiar* reaſon why you would honour this *Reformed Liturgy*, as you call it, pray *what* is it? Becauſe it is new? or becauſe you are for change? or for a third reaſon *you wot of*? Indeed Novelty, Change, and Property are three *great* Arguments with ſome men, that are no ſmall pretenders to *Antiquity*, *Reſolution*, and *ſelf-denial*.

But all this concerns not you: pray what are your *reaſons* for the uſe of it? you have told us nothing of it yet, but its *imperfections*, and I do not hear of any one hitherto that, from the *worth* and excellency of it, hath been induced to *practiſe* it: your reaſons may poſſibly draw ſome one or other to joine with you in that *new Liturgy*: In the mean time pardon me in the mention of an *odd* paſſage, I heard in the times of our *late*

Confu-

Confusions; *what Church* are you of pray, (one askt another) I am, quoth he, of Mr. *Barbers* Church? Mr. *Barbers* Church, a Church *I* have not heard of before, pray how *many members* have you? truely, saith he very gravely, we have none yet, but *him and I*; but we hope we shall have *more.*

CHAP. XVII.

More direct proof that this practise is Schysm. With considering the principles upon which they seperate.

I Shall fix my *foot* and prove more directly, that *such* seperation without *Just ground*, is plain Schysm in all the *Notion* of Schysm we have *hitherto* received in the Church of *God*, without any such consideration of the *Brownists* principles, denying the *truth* of the *Churches* or *Ministery*, or *lawfulness* of the *worship*, from which such seperation was made.

1. First in the *Scriptures*, Schysm is condemned with *dividing* the Church into *parties*, *forsaking* the *Assembling of our selves together*, seperating themselves, *drawing disciples* after them, *creeping into Houses*, and *leading silly women Captive*, and the like

like; without any ſuch thing, as *queſtioning*, much leſs *denying* the truth of thoſe *Churches*, *Miniſtry* or *Worſhip*, as is evident beyond all diſpute and to a plain *Demonſtration*, in thoſe *Schyſmaticks* in the Church of *Corinth*: who kept in their *publique Aſſemblies*, and indeed preferred *one* of their *Miniſters* in the *ſame* Church, before the reſt: but *denied* not *any* of them, except to *hear* them; and that was *their Schyſm*, though they complained not againſt either the *Conſtitution* of their Church, or the *corruptions* in it; which yet were great and many, both in *Doctrine*, *Worſhip*, and *Diſcipline*, as is well known.

Yea, though the *Miniſters* in *Corinth*, *walked in love together*, *and carried on the ſame work* of Chriſt, as you pretend with us, and made no ſuch attempts of *drawing parties* from their brethren, to themſelves, and had no hand at all in the *Schyſm*, that we read of, but the great *Apoſtle* himſelf diſlikes and *proteſts* againſt it, becauſe only the *people* too much admired *ſome*, to the diſlike of others of their *Miniſters*, they are charged with *Schyſm*, as before was noted.

2. Shortly after, we have an account of *Schiſm* from *Ignatius*, and what was it, but a not *owning* or ſubmiting to the Govern-

ment

ment of their *proper Bishops* and *Pastors*, without any ill reflections or denials of their *office*, or the truth of their *Churches*, or any such thing.

3. Next, we read of that great *Schysm* both of the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, (for neither could be freed from the charge of it) about the time of the celebration of *Easter*, upon this *slight* occasion, without any of the said *Brownistical* principles, they seperated from, by *refusing* Communion with one another, for *many years* together; and though the occasion was so very slight, it is noted for a great, yea therefore, for the *greater* Schysm in *Church story*.

4. After this, we read of the Schysm of *Donatism*: this, though it spread, and run very deep into Naughty, and much like to our later *Seperation-principles* about the Church at *last*; yet at *first* it was *occasioned* by a contention about the Bishoprick of *Cecilianus*, and therefore *branded* with the name of *Schysm*; especially, when the *Donatists* much like our late *Sectaries*, refused Communion with the Church, because *corruptions* were tollerated: contending that they were the only *pure Church* and spouse of Christ; and this is little otherwise, than what at present is pretended, by such as would not be called *Separatists*.

5, The

5. The great ground of Schysm observed from *Church story* by Mr. *Hales*, was generally, *contention about Bishops*, as it is now without any *Brownistical* principles.

Of Schysm p. 12.

He notes, that at first there was but one *Cathedral* Church in one *Diocess*, afterwards, some had *two* some more, and it happen'd many times, that these *Cathedrals* had *distinct Bishops*, and these by their *differences* many times came to have *distinct Churches*; and *these* Churches refused to communicate with one another for the sake of *their Bishops* which was called *Schysm*: though it was, no *Brownisme* it was a seperation very like to *ours* in our *Parish-Churches*, this was, saith St. *Cyprian*, *Erigere altare contra Altare*, and to this doth that *father* impute (as Mr. *Hales* further observes) all *Church-disorders*, and if you *read him you would think he thought no other Church-tumult to be Shysm but this.*

Indeed, *Schysm* is any unwarrantable *breach of unity* in the Church of God; where you find this, you find Schysm, let the *occasion* be what it will, tis a sinful *practice*, *dividing the Church*, by our *selves* or *others* and lies not in the *reason* of that *practice*, unless it be *considerable* for the *excuse* of it: as all *Divines consent.*

Contr Faust. l. 20. c. 3. & de fid. & oper. c. 3. & contr. Cresc. gr. l. 2. c. 7.

Heare St. *Austine*, *Schysma est*, &c. *Schysm is a late dissention or disagreement of a Congregation arising from some Diversity in opinion*; no matter what it be.

And again, more full to our purpose. *Schysmaticos facit non diversa fides, sed Communionis disrupta societas.* Do you ask *what is Schysm?* it is not a *differing Faith*, but a *breaking the fellowship* of Communion, which makes men *Schysmaticks.*

Yet more plainly, *Schysma est eadem opinantem & eodem Ritu utentem Solo Congregationis delectari dissidio.* Schysm is, when a *man, that professeth the same faith and worship, is delighted only with the difference of an Assembly or Congregation.* You might have advised this *Father* a *little better*, had he been now alive but, it seems, *your objection* was then urged by *some* that you are *loath to own*,

And this *same notion* of Schysm kept its ground in the Church from St. *Aug.* to *Beza's* time. *Σχίσμα sive διχοστασία est*, &c. Schysm or Division, saith *Beza* is this, *when men are so addicted to some men or to some outward Rites, that though they do agree in the chief points of Religion, yet they are estranged in their minds,*

An. in 1. Co. 1. 10.

and

and engage themſelves into parties and Factions. Thus *Beza*, and yet he paſſeth for a *Presbyterian*, and ſo doth Mr. *Newcomen*, who uſeth all theſe places of *Authority*, to *my* very *purpoſe*, againſt the *Independents*, who would it ſeems, have excuſed their *Schyſm* from the *Moderation* of their *principles*, and the *ſoundneſs* of their *Doctrine*,

Newcomen. Sr. at Pauls. p. 14.

He, therefore ſhall be the *next Presbyterian* that we ſhall produce for this *notion* of Schyſm, not *neceſſarily inclusive* of the *Browniſts* rigid *principles*.

He tells us plainly, as I obſerved in my *other* book, *their holding one head and one faith with us doth not excuſe them from being guilty of breach of unity and down-right Schyſm, as long as they hold not one body, one Baptiſm.* As if he had ſaid, let your principles be what they will, you are *down-right Schyſmaticks* while you ſeperate and *break our unity*.

Ep to his Reſt printed 1669.

As for *Seperation*, Mr. *Baxter* tells us, that the *miſchief* of it lies not in the *bare error* of judgment, but in the unchriſtian and *Church-diſſolving* diviſion, and Alienation which thence followeth.

Yea, let us know the man that did ever

directly or by any clear consequence to be drawn from his words, print *such* a *Notion* of *Schysm*, as includes the *Brownists* rigid principles about our *Churches*, &c. in the *Nature* of it. Examine *Cameron*, *Ames*, *Hales*, *Brinsly*, and if any others be *dearer* to you, and see, whether their *definitions* take in any *such* thing; or can bear such an *exposition*, as you would put upon them. See how Mr. *Cawdrey* and the *London Ministers*, at *Sion-Colledg* deal with the *Independents* in the point; and whether you can possibly perswade your self, to continue in the beleif, that for the *reasons* you have alledged, the *Non-Conformists* may *gather Churches* and not be *Seperatists* in the judgment of the *Presbyterians*, before the year 1660. or any of the old *Non-Conformists*: you may see their Judgment in general by a few quotations out of their writings.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Testimonies of Non-Conformists for the same.

GIve me leave to usher in this worthy *verdict*, with an Argument after your own *mode*.

I will undertake to prove, that the *Non-Conformists*, *both Ancient and Modern, before* 1660. held, *gathering Churches out of our Churches unlawful* and Schysmatical, and that absolutely, without any reference to the *principles* upon which it is don, much less the *Brownistical*.

Do you prove afterwards, if it be possible, that they supposed your *New distinctions* and evasions, or that they, at any time let words drop from them signifying an allowance of *Seperation* from our Churches and setting up *new ones*, upon such weak *grounds* as you stand upon.

Mr. Ball. Mr. *Ball I* had mentioned in my last, as one of the old *Puritans*, that had wrote for Communion with *our* Parochial Congregations; you tell

me *subtilly*, that he speaks not against Non-Conformists *preaching*, and thats an Answer. But I must now add, that, that *great* Nonconformist doth not plead for our Communion as *lawful*, but in a sort *necessary*; and that to seperate from us is a *sinfull Seperation*.

Ep to his 1. vol. Friendly Tryal. He telleth you *roundly*, that *such Seperation* is the *Wound* of the Church, ——— yea, whosoever *seperateth from the body of the Church seperateth from Christ in that respect.* ——— *Voluntary Seperation from the Lords Table, and the Prayers* (he reckoned upon more than *hearing Sermons*) of the Congregation, what is but a *willing Excommunicating of our selves from the visible tokens of the Lords presence* and love ——— *is it not a greater sin in Members to* deprive *themselves* (*then in the Church Governors to deprive others*) *of the same Communion for small occasions*? you see he makes the *smalness* of the occasion of *Seperation* to be Emphasis and *Aggravation* of it.

Again more smartly in his Answer to *Cann. Epistle* Thus, 'Seperation from the true Churches of Christ, his Ministery and Worship (of which sort I shall 'prove that to be by the word of God, for 'which I plead) meaning the Church of *England*

'gland) tendeth not to the overthrow of 'Anti-Christ, but to the Reating of the 'Church, the disgrace of Religion, the 'Advancement of Pride, Schysm, Contenti-'on, the offence of the weak, the grief of 'the Godly, who be better setled, the hard-'ning of the Wicked, and the Recovery or 'rising again of Anti-Christ.

2. Let worthy Mr. *Hildersham* lay down his grave and weighty point clearly and boldly, and like himself 'tis this; *Those* Assemblies that enjoy the *Word* and *Doctrine* of Salvation; though they have *many Corruptions* remaining in them, are to be acknowledged the true Churches of God, and such as none of the faithful may make Separation from. (He will not allow you, upon pretence of purity and *serving God better* in your way, to seperate and gather Churches, not any one, *none of the faithful*) he proceeds to prove it *largely*: and it may be well known how *severe* he is, against the *faithful*, that will *ordinarily* leave their *honest Minister*, to hear those that are more able: upon pretences of *profiting* better by them: which is yet the *best plea* the *present Separation* hath for it self.

Hildersham upon 4. Joh. p. 149.

Calvin Instit. li. 4. *c.* 1 *sect.* 9, 10, 12.

3. 'M. *Calvin* speaks to the 'point with no *mean* Authority

'rity. He tells us, that wheresoever the 'Gospel is *purely preached*, and the *Sacra* 'ments Administred according to the *Insti*'tution of *Christ*; there is the *Church* of God. '——— There appears neither a *deceitful* nor 'doubtful face of a Church, of which no 'man may either despise the *Authority*, or 'refuse the *Admonition*; or resist the *Counsels* 'or mock at the *Corrections*; much less de'part from it, breaks in sunder the Unity 'of it, and go unpunished.

'For the Lord so highly esteems the *Com*'munion of the Church, that he counts him 'for a *Traiterous run-away*, and forsaken of 'Religion; whosoever shall *stubburnly e*'*strange* himself from any Christian fellow'ship, so that it be *such* a one as hath the 'true *Ministry* of the word and *Sacra*'ments.

'The fellowship of *such* a Church, is not 'to be cast off; although it swarm *full of* 'faults, though there be faults in the Ad'ministration, either of *Doctrine*, or of the 'Sacraments; yet we ought not to *estrange* 'our selves from the Communion of it: for 'all the *Articles* be not of one sort: and 'therefore for every *light dissention* we ought not *rashly* to forsake the *Church*.

4. The *value* which our *English* Presbyterians just before the *Wars*, had of our *Church*

Letter of many Ministers in Old England, to their brethren in new E. pub by Mr. Ash, &c 1643.

Church and its *Lay-Communion* is not *impertinent* but very considerable: together, with the *Censure* they then pass'd upon such as *refused* it.

'They speak to their brethren in New 'England thus, if we deny Communion 'with such a Church as *ours*, there hath been '*no* Church these 1400 *years*, with which 'a Christian might *lawfully joine*. Nay, 'that if such scruples as are now in your 'heads may take place, it will be *unlaw-'ful* to hold Communion with any *society under Heaven*.

Gifford Printed 1595.

5. Mr. *Gifford* an old Non-Conformist, wrote a book call'd a *plain Declaration*; wherein he doth not vindicate every thing in our Church; but that there is no *sufficient Cause* of seperation; Complains thus, 'some are proceeded to this that they will 'come to the Assemblies to *hear Sermons* 'and the *Prayers* of the *Preacher*; but not 'to the *prayers* of the *Book*; which I take to 'be a more *grievous* sin than many do sup-'pose. But yet this is not the worst, for *su-'dry* are gon *farther*; and faln into a damna-'ble *Schysm*; and the same so much the more '*fearful* and dangerous in that many do

'not

'not see the foulneſs of it; but rather hold 'them as *Godly* Chriſtians; and but a little over-ſhot in ſome matters.

6. We come now to review the Teſtimonies we gave in our laſt, from the late Preſbiterian Controverſie with the Independents: we pitcht upon ſome words of the *Provincial Aſſembly* in *London*: and the Argument ſent to the *Aſſembly* of *Divines* by the *London Miniſters* from *Sion Colledge*, two eminent *bodies* of known *Presbyterians*. And we yet ſee no reaſon to judg, but their words and Arguments are *very direct* and full to the purpoſe; eſpecially conſidering, the moſt pittiful ſhifts of our Anſwerer about them.

Jus divin. Reg. Eccl. As to the words, in the *Divine right of Presbytery*, he ſaith, that book was ſuppoſed to be penn'd by *Dr Roberts* now a *Conformiſt*. But what doth he mean? was he a Conformiſt then? or doth not the book plead for the *Presbytery*, *and* its *Jus Divinum*? and in the ſame ſence by which he himſelf defines a *Presbyterian*? yea, was it not owned by, and publiſhed under the name of the *provincial Aſſembly of Presbyterians*? and what matter is it then who *pen'd* it? the like dealing you uſe about Mr. *Trapp*: you ſay he is a *Conformiſt*, what then? hath he not given a juſt account

account of the book written by the *London Miniſters*, as I ſaid he did? their reaſons alledged by *me*, were alledged by a *Conformiſt*: yet they are *theirs* ſtill. What manner of anſwering is this? It were not pardonable with *ſome Adverſaries*, but you are faln into merciful hands.

The *Authority* of the perſons then is clear: the words I cited out of the preface to that book called, *Jus Divinum regiminis Eccleſiaſtici*, were theſe, *Parochial Churches are received as true viſible Churches of Chriſt, and moſt convenient for edification: gathering Churches out of Churches hath no footſteps in Scripture: is contrary to Apoſtolical practice: is the ſcattering of Churches, the Daughter of Schyſm: the Mother of Confuſion and the ſtep-Mother of edification.*

Obſerve, they condemn *gathering Churches* out of our Churches: *abſolutely*, and without any *reſpect* to the *principles* upon which it was done particularly, they call it the *Daughter of Schyſm*, *ſeperation* in order unto the gathering of Churches being *Schyſm* it ſelf, in the then *Presbyterian* opinion.

Sion-Coll. The *Arguments*, *I* took out of the *Letter* of the *London Miniſters* to the *Aſſembly* were theſe, the *Independents are guilty of Schyſm.* 1. Becauſe they *refuſe*

fuse Communion with our Churches in the Sacraments. 2. They *erect seperate Congregations* under a seperate undiscovered *Government*: never charging them with any *Brownistical* principles, but the *fact* it self, an undoubted proof of what they undertook to prove.

Again to the same purpose, they charge them with *three* great *Scandals*, how you will avoid either of them I cannot *Devine*. 1. *That they seperated from the true Church*. 2. That they endeavoured by *drawing Members out of it* to make up their *seperate Churches*, to weaken and diminish the *Church*. 3. That they endeavoured to get a warrant to authorize both, *viz.* by a *Toleration*: and *this*, say they, we think to be plainly *unlawful*.

Now, hereupon, I am bold to challenge our *Answerer*, or *any one* else, to prove clearly, that any one Eminent *Presbyterian* before 1660. was not utterly against all the *three*, against such *seperation*, such *gathering* Churches, and *such Toleration*. Convince me if you can: but not by telling me *they* are *now* for them *all*. That they would *Tolerate*, *things Tolerable*, that is *gathering Churches*: and *persons* Tolerable, that is *Presbyterians*, as you speak very *intelligibly*.

But

But no wonder, they are chang'd in their thoughts of these things: *the case is Alter'd*, as you hint.

True, there are some *new impositions* upon *Ministerial* Conformity; but other *Alterations* render our Lay-Communion more easily than it was before the wars, when the *Presbyterian* denied it not; as was noted out of Mr. *Baxter* before; who also assures us that he never heard of *five Non-Conformists*, besides the *five dissenting brethren* in *the Assembly at Westminster*; he means, they conformed as *Ministers* of the Church of *England* before they sate there.

Defence of his cure p. 13.

However, *that Churches may not be gathered out of Churches* is asserted not as a *Temporary* truth, but moral: depending upon the *Nature* of a Church which *never alters*: or gives any occasion of *change*, in the judgment, about this point.

Cawdrey. The Books of Mr. *Cawdrey*, 'that *Captain* in the *Presbyterian* Army against Dr. *Owen*, and the *Independents*, challenge you all. We may, saith he, 'prove them to be Schysmatical. 1. by a *voluntary Seperation* from true Churches; 'with whom we dare say, they may Communicate *without sin*, and so consequently, 'causelessly rending *the body of Christ*. 2. By their

'their *renouncing Communion* with us, to 'set up a Church of ano- 'ther *constitution*; and so 'condemning our Churches 'ipso facto, as no *truely* constituted Churches. Mark, *condemning our Churches ipso facto.* Their *very Act* is enough; whether they *avow* such *principles* or not: and consequently, what ever you pretend to the contrary; your very *departure* from us, and making *new Churches*, does of *it self* condemn you of *Schysm.*

Indep. further proved Schys. p. 73, 74

Ind. great Schysm. He concludes his *first* book bravely, they, saith he, that 'raise *differences* in them *i. e.* 'in our Churches: and *draw disciples* from 'them and *renounce Communion* with them, 'say what they please or can to the contrary 'are Schysmaticks *quod erat demonstran-* 'dum.

I only assume, that generally the *Non-Conformists make differences* in our Churches, *draw Disciples* from them, and *renounce* Communion with them, *quod est demonstratum*, And now *I* beg leave of my Answerer to conclude with the words in my last, that so much offended him; that I am sure the Presbyterians, (if they walk by the principles of their Fathers before the Kings return) I am sure, I say, that they have *no*

reason

reaſon to engage in a *way of publique worſhip*, *contradiſtinct to our Parochial Congregation.*

Of Schiſm, p. 53. The *Iſſue* of the *travers*, ſaith Mr. *Brinſley*, is no more but 'this. It there be amongſt us, a '*Seperation* from a true Church, and that 'both *voluntary* and *unwarrantable* [as the '*preſent* practice of gathering Churches by 'the *Presbyterians* is] (which *I* ſuppoſe the '*evidences* given in, have ſufficiently *evicted*) 'then muſt we give ſentence, that there is 'more then either *crimen nominis*, or *no-*'*men criminis*, no leſs than a *Schiſm for-*'*mally* and *properly* ſo called.

CHAP. XXI.

Gathering of Churches ought not to be practiſed, as now it is, either, in Conſcience, or prudence. Objections anſwered.

YEt, we are not at a full *Agreement:* he ſeems every where, to take it for *granted*, that, weare now, at *perfect liberty*, to *gather new Churches* or not, which, by no means, *I* allow, while my *principles* ſtand *undemoliſh't*: Such as *theſe.*

That our *Church of England* is a true Church:

Church that our *parochial Congregations* are true Churches that the people *of England* are generally, Members of *this Church* and *Churches*, or at least *ought* so to be. That they *lawfully* may, and consequently are, in *Duty* and *Conscience* bound to *Communicate* with them. And therefore, for them to *Seperate*, and to *gather themselves* into *new* Congregations, of *another* constitution, is plainly *sinful* and Schysmatical.

Upon the *premises*, I doe conclude, that *Conscience* ought first to be consulted in the case: and the many *obligations* thereof, effectually and *totally* removed, before you can make it a matter of *indifferency* in it self, and of *more Christian prudence pro hic & nunc*, as you seem to affirm.

Our *Obligation* to this Communion falls many wayes upon us: from our *Relation* to the *Church*; the *Laws* of *cohabitation* of Church-Members, the Laws of the *Kingdome*, and the *long* continued practice of this Church: none of all which, are in the least *touched*, much lets *Altered* or *Repealed* by the *Declaration* of *Indulgence*.

Besides, the many *expresse Scriptures* against our *forsaking* our (wonted) *Assemblies*, *Seperating our selves*, *making parties* and divisions in the Church: having our *Teachers* in too much *Admiration*, and *heaping*

them

them up to our ſelves, and receiving the *faith with reſpect of perſons*: and *drawing Diſciples after us*, in all which, both the *preſent caſe*, and the *ſeveral Conſciences* of the *Non-conformiſts*, whether *Preachers* or *people*, are in my opinion, not *lightly* concerned. Shake of the *Burthen* as well as you can.

Until *theſe* things be better anſwered, I muſt add here; that the caſe is of weight in *point of Conſcience*, as well as *prudence*: and that *gathering Churches*, as now you do, is a breach of the *Laws* both of *God* and *Man*; a *Sin* againſt our *Church* in her *Right*, in our *perſons* and *fellowſhip*: both with reſpect to our *Paſtors* and *Brethren* and a plain *breach of our Covenant* with them *all*; a *breach* of the Churches *Unity*, and *Order*, and *Ancient bounds* and *Cuſtoms*, and in the *Teachers* that draw away our people, beſides all that hath been ſaid, a plain *robbing of God*, the Church and our *Brother*. To conclude, if the *Laws* of *Piety*, *Juſtice*, *Temperance*, or *Charity*, can reach the *Conſcience*, every one of which are violated by this *gathering of Churches*, the caſe is not a *work of meer Chriſtian prudence*, and *to be determined only comparing the good and evil conſequents together*, as you ſay *p.* 21.

But ſuppoſing my *foundations* to ſtand firm, and *Conſcience* in the point *well ſecu-*

'their *renouncing Communion* with us, to 'set up a Church of another *constitution*; and so 'condemning our Churches '*ipso facto*, as no *truely* constituted Churches. Mark, *condemning our Churches ipso facto*. Their *very Act* is enough; whether they *avow* such *principles* or not: and consequently, what ever you pretend to the contrary; your very *departure* from us, and making *new Churches*, does of *it self* condemn you of *Schysm*.

Indep. further provd Schys p.73,74

He concludes his *first* book bravely, they, saith he, that '*raise differences* in them *i. e.* 'in our Churches: and *draw disciples* from 'them and *renounce Communion* with them, 'say what they please or can to the contrary 'are Schysmaticks *quod erat demonstrandum*.

Ind. great Schysm.

I only assume, that generally the *Non-Conformists make differences* in our Churches, *draw Disciples* from them, and *renounce* Communion with them, *quod est demonstratum*, And now *I* beg leave of my Answerer to conclude with the words in my last, that so much offended him; that I am sure the Presbyterians, (if they walk by the principles of their Fathers before the Kings return) I am sure, I say, that they have *no*

reason

reaſon to engage in a *way of publique worſhip, contradiſtinct to our Parochial Congregation.*

Of Schiſm, p. 53. The *Iſſue* of the *travers*, ſaith Mr. *Brinſley*, is no more but 'this. If there be amongſt us, a '*Seperation* from a true Church, and that 'both *voluntary* and *unwarrantable* [as the '*preſent* practice of gathering Churches by 'the *Presbyterians* is] (which *I* ſuppoſe the '*evidences* given in, have ſufficiently *evicted*) 'then muſt we give ſentence, that there is 'more then either *crimen nominis*, or *no-*'*men criminis*, no leſs than a *Schiſm for-*'*mally* and *properly* ſo called.

CHAP. XXI.

Gathering of Churches ought not to be practiſed, as now it is, either, in Conſcience, or prudence. Objections anſwered.

YEt, we are not at a full *Agreement:* he ſeems every where, to take it for *granted*, that, we are now, at *perfect liberty*, to *gather new Churches* or not, which, by no means, *I* allow, while my *principles* ſtand *undemoliſh't*: Such as *theſe.*

That our *Church of England* is a true Church:

Church that our *parochial Congregations* are true Churches that the people *of England* are generally, Members of *this Church* and *Churches*, or at least *ought* so to be. That they *lawfully* may, and consequently are, in *Duty* and *Conscience* bound to *Communicate* with them. And therefore, for them to *Seperate*, and to *gather themselves* into *new* Congregations, of *another* constitution, is plainly *sinful* and Schysmatical.

Upon the *premises*, I doe conclude, that *Conscience* ought first to be consulted in the case: and the many *obligations* thereof, effectually and *totally* removed, before you can make it a matter of *indifferency* in it self, and of *more Christian prudence pro hic & nunc*, as you seem to affirm.

Our *Obligation* to this Communion falls many wayes upon us: from our *Relation* to the Church; the *laws* of *cohabitation* of Church-Members, the Laws of the *Kingdome*, and the *long* continued practice of this Church: none of all which, are in the least *touched*, much lefs *Altered* or *Repealed* by the *Declaration* of *Indulgence*.

Besides, the many *expresse Scriptures* against our *forsaking* our (wonted) *Assemblies*, *Seperating our selves*, *making parties* and divisions in the Church: having our *Teachers* in too much *Admiration*, and *heaping* them

them up to our ſelves, and receiving the *faith with reſpect of perſons*: and *drawing Diſciples after us*, in all which, both the *preſent caſe*, and the *ſeveral Conſciences* of the *Non-conformiſts*, whether *Preachers* or *people*, are in my opinion, not *lightly* concerned. Shake of the *Burthen* as well as you can.

Until *theſe* things be better anſwered, I muſt add here; that the caſe is of weight in *point of Conſcience*, as well as *prudence*: and that *gathering Churches*, as now you do, is a breach of the *Laws* both of *God* and *Man*; a *Sin* againſt our *Church* in her *Right*, in our *perſons* and *fellowſhip*: both with reſpect to our *Paſtors* and *Brethren* and a plain *breach of our Covenant* with them *all*, a *breach* of the Churches *Unity*, and *Order*, and *Ancient bounds* and *Cuſtoms*, and in the *Teachers* that draw away our people, beſides all that hath been ſaid, a plain *robbing of God*, the Church and our *Brother*. To conclude, if the *Laws* of *Piety*, *Juſtice*, *Temperance*, or *Charity*, can reach the *Conſcience*, every one of which are violated by this *gathering of Churches*, the caſe is not a *work of meer Chriſtian prudence*, and *to be determined only comparing the good and evil conſequents together*, as you ſay *p.* 21.

But ſuppoſing my *foundations* to ſtand firm, and *Conſcience* in the point *well ſecured*:

red: we may *parly* a little upon it in point of *prudence*: especially, seeing, you affirm *p.* 21. that, he *that through imprudence misjudgeth either way doth sin.* Moreover you confess, that the *case is now of so great moment, that no Minister should rash'y determine it for himself, p.* 20. nor upon the desires of some of the *people* only; but should consult with *wise* and sober men that are *impartial*, but, if the case be *so difficult* for the *Readers*, who you say, *must preach*, how difficult is the case for the *people?* for it is, *no where* said, they *must seperate*, and leave *us* to *hear you*, yea, *your self* teach the *contrary.*

You state your *nice Case*, thus, *p.* 17, 18. whether in *competent parishes*, which have *Able* and *Godly* conformable Ministers, the *obligation* to hold Union and Communion with the *parish-Church*; or the *obligation* to exercise a *more regular* way of Church-*Discipline* and *worship*, than the *Parish Churches* do or will do, should be judged the more prevalent; and consequently, whether they should *gather Churches* out of Churches in this?

A Case *not* so *difficult*, as you seem to make it, if there be as you have heard, so much obligation upon Conscience to the *former* part of it touching *Communion* with us: and *none* at all left, for their *gathering-Churches*

for

for the ends assigned by you, for they can neither *leave us* without sin; nor *gather Churches* without sin; as, we hope it hath appeared.

Your opinion is given upon a double *supposition*, and both of them *false*. 1. That the case is *indifferent*; or, at least the obligation to both, *so equal*, as, that it is to be weighed *only* by *prudence*. 2. That it is lawful and a *duty to* be a Member of such a *Parish-Church* (only) when we can *have* and *do* no *better* [*i. e.* in our own opinion] and that when we *can*, we have *liberty to forsake our own Church*, though, I confess your *explication* of having or *doing better*, hath some *tendency* to a *right* determination of this great point, viz: you say, *we cannot have or do better, when it cannot be without a greater hurt to the publique interest of the Gospel, the Church, and the souls of men, then the benefit to us and others is like to countervail.* But I must add (as the case requires,) especially, when *that benefit*, cannot be had *without sinning* our selves, and drawing *others* to *sin* with us by our *endeavours*, *Scandal*, and *example*; which, I think, we too plainly and *manifestly* do, by *gathering Churches*.

Now give me leave, to make a *supposition*; and I shall immediately take the *Scale* and *weigh* the consequents, as you say, on both

sides. My supposition is, that this case which you call the *difficult one*, is the very case with most *Non-Conformists*, who do now gather Churches, for as our *Parish-Ministers* are generally, more *Tolerable* then you seem to allow them; so, especially are *they* of the *better sort*, and truely *able*, and *Godly*, and our Parishes, in your own sense, *competent* enough, where, for the most part, they have hitherto set about this *new experiment*, which, it seems, renders the case so *difficult* in your own opinion, that, I fear, you will have cause enough to *censure* the *rashness* of their unadvised undertaking of it.

But now to the *Scales*, wherin we must weigh. 1. The *Benefits* to be hoped. 2. The *evils* to be feared, will follow such gathering Churches.

You pitch upon *three* great *Benefits*. 1. The pleasing of God (*when we know it is his will*) and the profit of mens souls by the most regular manner of *discipline* and *Worship*. [But be sure you know it *is his Will*] you your selfmake it *very difficult* to know this, even for the *Teachers*; how much more for the *people*. The *same* Argument will put us upon the Reformation of the *State* too, when we know it is *Gods will*. This we know to be *Gods will*; that we serve God the

the *best* we can *in our places*: that we move for a *Reforma ion* in a *peaceable* and regular way, that we preserve the *unity* and Communion of the Church. That we *obey our* Civil and Ecclesiastical *Governors*: these things we know to be *Gods will*: and we know that he is not the *God of Confusion*, but of *order* in his Churches; and what tends to *disorder* and confusion, we know it is *not Gods will*; but how we shall know that it is *his will* we should *reform* the Church *upon our own heads*, and therefore *Seperate* from true Churches and *gather Churches*, in order to *better Worship* and discipline, if so it prove, this we know *not*.

2. The *second Benefit*, is the *setting up an imitable Example of right Discipline, and worship to other Churches* i.e. Setting up a *Standard* with the former *Narrative* of the *grounds* of the *War*. But heads, severely, *then woe to them that set up a worse*. And, in your Conscience, is not *this woe* likely to be *general*? how many *hundred* years hath our *Discipline* been exposed to examination, and for the substance of it, what part can *envy* it self, find fault with this? are the *short Counsels* of our *new* Reformers likely to *mend* it? besides, how will you do, that are for *Episcopacy*? you will not regulate that by having *none*; or by making *other Bi-*

shops I hope. As for our *Worship*, *I* presume, the *Reformed Liturgy* will not take place, except in *your own* Congregation? and sure, *that* we have already, is *better* than *none* at all: as it is with your brethren of the *new Churches*.

3. Your *last benefit* is a *marvellous* one indeed, *the satisfying the Consciences of honest mistaken people, who think it unlawful to communicate with us.* i. e. *we must break the Churches in pieces, to feed* the *mistakes* and ill humours of *honest* people, if they are *honest*, remove their mistakes, teach them *truth*, and *wisdome*, and *peace*, and *duty*, and perswade them to keep *their* Station and Communion with us; and I doubt not, but that *you* and *they* will find *this* to be the *greatest benefit* of the *two* at last, as well as *we*.

You may see there is *no good* to be done by the *practise*, and you, in the next place, see what a *swarm* of *mischiefs* attend it. I shall observe the things *you fear* your self; and indeed, they are more in *number*, *weight*, and *measure* too, then the *benefits* you mentioned.

1. 'This *mischief* is likely to follow their 'gathering-Churches as you well observe: 'the *exasperating the minds for number and* 'quality considerable, *and so alienating from* their

'*their brethren*, *and hindring them.* 2. 'Thereby weakning the *Protestant Interest* 'in a time which requireth our *greatest con-* 'cord. 3. Then setteng of *parties against* 'parties, and *Churches* against *Churches*; and 'turning of *Religion* into contentions and 'mutual oppositions. 4. The countenance- 'ing of *unlawful* Seperations; which will 'all *shelter* themselves under such examples, 'and the *Dividers* will not see the *different* 'principles on which we go, while our *pra-* 'ctice seemeth to be the same. 5. And so it 'may be injurious to *future* ages, by seeming 'to give them *Presidents* for unlawful *Sepe-* 'ration. 6. And it is not the *least* evil con- 'sequent, that we shall cherish not only 'the error of those that think *worse* of the 'Parish-*Worship* and Assemblies than there is 'cause; but we shall also accidentally nou- 'rish their *pride*, who will think themselves 'a *holier people*, because they erroniously 'over-*censure* the persons and practices of o- 'thers.

These are they *evil consequents*, which you wisely for-see will follow these *new Churches*: and you cannot, I think, *prudently* avoid them, but by *forbearing* that practice, and *perswading* your brethren to do so likewise. For you confess, when the *publique good* forbids it [as no doubt, it now doth] *p.* 22.

The *Tolerated* Ministers must not *gather distinct Church-Assemblies*, but *joyn with the publique Churches, and help the people by their instructions at other times.* And not to *lay* up the people in their *weakness, which you well observe, p. 23. inclineth them to causeless seperations and disjunctions.*

But who shall now hold the *beam?* let any hand but your own, and, I am sure, the inconveniences you have mentioned, must needs *preponderate*, those *shadows* of benefit that the practice pretends to.

'Tis the known and *stated* judgment of the Church in *all* Ages that defects, yea and many *corruptions* (which you charge us not withal) are far *more tollerable*, and not so hazardous to the Church, as *Seperation* by the *breach* of *unity*; and then what shall we think of the *formal* and positive Schysm in *gathered Churches.*

The *Novatians, Audeans*, and *Donatists* had all the same pretence, of *better discipline and worship* than the publique; therefore, they *gathered themselves* into distinct *Churches* for *reformation* and *greater purity* in Religion: but for this, they stand recorded for *Schysmaticks* and *Pests* of the Church, in the writings of the *Fathers* and *Church-Historians.*

You acknowledge, our *errors are Tollerable,*

ble, (else you would not Communicate with us:) and this is a *ſtanding* rule in the Church, *ſi error eſt Tolerabilis, non oportet fieri Seceſſionem.* If the errors or *ſcandals* of the Church be *Tolerable*, we ought not to leave it, and what's the reaſon? becauſe of the dangerous *conſequents* that have ever followed *Seperation*, and the *beauty* and *holineſs* of *unity* in Religion.

Cameron. de Schyſ.

Sir I perceive *I* need not endeavour to quicken your ſenſe of the *fearful effects* of ſeperation: and ſhould I *begin* to ſpeak of them there would be no *end*; God grant we may never feel them; and therefore that *you*, and *I*, and *every man*, may do our *proper* endeavour to prevent and heal them. *Schyſmate luxantur membra Eccleſiæ. Membra luxata inepta ſunt ad ſua munera obeunda: membra luxata graviſſimo dolore corpus afficiunt.* *Schyſm* in the Church puts the members *out of joynt*: members out of joynt are *unfit for ſervice*: and cauſe great *dolours* and diſquietment to the *whole body*.

Parens.

P. Mart.

What *ſharp contentions* and ruptures in the bowels of the *Church*, what *Wars* and deſolations in *Nations*, hath Schyſm been the original of? what *ſighs* and *warnings* did the ſeperation of the *Browniſt* draw from the

the *Puritans*? and of the late *Sectaries* from the *Presbyterians*? all this cannot be forgotten, though in the midst of our *Bustles*, and our *new joyes* for our present *liberty*, we mind it not.

I shall not repent my *former inconveniences*: the fear of which, at least, *some of them*, is yet still upon us: notwithstanding, *&c.*

Vid Baxt def. of his cure p. 51, 52, 53 *&c.*

Dividing principles will give shelter to all kind of Heresies and Sects; of which experience is too full a proof——and shall we stand by and see this work go on, and neither lament their sin that drive men to this, nor warn them of the passions and principles that lead to it? and who knoweth not how fair a game the Papists have to play by the means of our Divisions?

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

More particular addreſs to the Anſwer, a friendly expoſtulation about his hard words and dealing. We muſt preach. And we may gather Churches to ſerve God better: two great cheats, a deſire he would detect them.

Sir, I perceive, by ſome *Golden* lines, drawn here and there, upon your *Rough* and Rugged peice (pardon the expreſſions) that though we differ in our *meaſures*, yet, we intend the ſame *end*: and in general, by the ſame *means*. Let us then, in cold blood, as friends faln out uſe to do, let us *expoſtulate* a little, and be *friends* again.

I confeſs, I thought I could not reply to *much* of your book, but in *Mirth* or *Anger*: the former I rather choſe, and have ſometimes uſed, but make it my publique requeſt, that neither your ſelf, nor any one elſe would take it in *contempt* of your perſon or parts.

But

But if my *pleasantness* hath, indeed, displeased you; pray, reflect a little seriously upon the *manner*, how you dealt with me, without any *provocation*. And consider both the *Example* and *Rule*, you give me. p. 4. and I am apt to conceive, you will require no further *satisfaction*: yea, and that for the future, you will learn this *lesson*; not to *despise* your Adversaries person or parts; least of *one* you make *two*; and instead of *Reason*, you stir up and provoke *Folly* and *Madness*.

If any thing hath miss'd my eye, and consideration, that you conceive to be *argumentative*. believe me, it was not *design'd*. I left your *Method*, because I had a mind to *review* the point *throughly*, and *once for all*: and therefore you are secure from any *further* trouble from me, in this matter (unless *I* see more reason *hereafter*, than now I can foresee,) Yet I promise you, that if, without *Insulting*, you will shew me any *Argument* which was overlookt, *I* promise you faithfully, I will either *Answer* it, or acknowledge I cannot.

Indeed, some *parts* of your Book I have *willingly* declined to insist upon; there being observable in them, the defects of *Pertinence* and *Charity*: which I impute to your *haste* and *hastiness*: and thank God, that I know how

how to allow ſomething to the *beſt* of men, for their *Natural Temper*.

Yet ſo far as we are *vertuous*, we cannot be unwilling to hear of our *faults*, eſpecially, with *meekneſs* of reaſon, and in a *friendly* expoſtulation: which, *I* hope, may well enough admit me to tell you *plainly*, that *I* have found neither *kind words*, nor *fair dealing* in your book.

For your *Words*: calling my Arguments *ſilly*; queſtioning my *Witt* and *Modeſty*, rendring me guilty of *Noiſe*, inſtead of *Sence*; of *Confuſion* and immeaſurable *confidence*; *theſe*, and ſuch like, do not *much* affect me, but *I* confeſs, when you ſpeak of my *pernitious fallacies*, that goes ſomething near me, as alſo when you number me with *factious diſputers*; when, God knows, *I* intended nothing, as *I* ſaid in my laſt, but *to ſave the people from ſin*, and the *Church from confuſion* and ruine, by groſs *Seperation*.

For your *fair dealing*, *I* mean, not only, that you would *make* me affirm, what *I never* ſaid, or thought, for of that *I* have delivered my ſelf *before*: or ſo much that you ſeem to ly upon the *Catch* for little *overſights*, which concern not the *Controverſy*; though by the way take an *Inſtance* or two of *this* Nature.

Whereas *I* ſay, *p.* 28. they *cannot but under-*

understand the Declaration to prohibite all such private meetings as the Law calls conventicles. What an *out-cry* do we hear? you *know not whose understandings you talk of*——and with Scorn——why *should you judge us to be as wise as your self.*

But where's the *victory*? doth not the very *Declaration* it self suppose *unlawful Conventicles*? or what if *I* had slipt, and put in the word *Law* for *Declaration*? was it unpardonable? it looks ill, when we *design* disgrace to our Adversary, without any advantage to our *Cause*, and what have you gained by this *Noble* quarrel, but the name of *Conventicles*? and so branded by the *Law*; a name, one would think, not much worth the contention, if we Admit the Learned *Hale's* definition of it; a *Conventicle* saith he, is *nothing else but a Congregation of Schysmaticks.*

Tract of Schysm p.14

Take but *one* Instance more; *I* had said, *p.* 1,. that I *thought I might safely say, that the Declaration doth not so much as uncommand any thing which the Law properly commands.* But had you heeded *one* word among the rest, you would hardly have entred this exception: *p.* 46. *I* mean the word, *properly*; which you, to *seeming* Advantage leave out in your *Reflexion*, for who knows not, that the *main matter* for which

which the *Law* is framed, is the thing *properly*, and directly *commanded* by the *Law*? and that the *execution* of the penalty, and the command *thereof*, are but in subserviency thereunto; and, only of force, *conditionally*, in case the *Law*, in the *proper* matter of it, be disabused?

And your exception to the *other* paragraph, hath yet less colour. *I* say, the *Declaration medles not with the Law either in the preceptive or punitive part of it*. But *I* still take it to be *beyond* your skill in the Law, to confute me in this; and to be beyond dispute, that the *Law* in *both* these parts of it, had its *being* from the *Legeslative* power; and the *Declaration* from the *Executive* power: and that *this* cannot operate, to the change of that at all. The true *internal* vigour of the Law is still the same; and 'tis your mistake to think that the *Declaration* suspends the *command*, or so much as the *punitive* part of the Law: it suspendeth only the Actual *Execution* of the Law, as *pœnal*: and allows *such* meetings, as *break* the Law, and *incur* its penalty, to abide *unpunished*; think on it *well*, and you may be of my mind.

Of *these* by the way, which indeed had not found their place *here*, could *I* have reduced them to any *head* of discourse above: yet now *I* am upon it let me whisper it in your ear, without

without any great noise about it, that there is *one* Paragraph of *yours*, that, could I take pleasure in such *little* reflections, I could shew, to have as many *real* Solœcisms in it, as you have noted in my *whole* Book.

p. 45 last par. or Sect

But, I am not careful for *these* things: you deal *more* hardly with me, when you lay *presumption* and cruelty to the Non-conformists *at my door*, cannot I imagine that they do not *only desire to escape the penalty of the Laws*, but *erect seperate Churches to themselves*; but I must be an *Ithacian Master*, and make you *feel* my *meaning*, and give occasion to cry out as you do, *but, my Brother, what good will our sufferings do you? do you feel your self ever the more at liberty when we are in the Common-Goales? are you the fuller because some Non-Conformists want bread?*

Is this reasonable, charitable, or *candid?* what *ground* have you for it, either in my *words* or *deeds*? would you not think you had *wrong'd* me, if *some* Non-Conformists should tell you, that I have run *some hazards* and suffered in my *Name* for *their* Liberty? and if a peaceable *silenc'd* Minister should testify, that he and his *Family* have many years together, had the *greatest* part of their livelyhood from my *Charity?* But I must forbear, though you provoke me, least you

you ſhould have juſt cauſe to impeach my *Modeſty*, and think you have cauſe to ſay, that I, in a ſenſe, call you *Perſecutor*.

But who am I, when, alas, the *whole body* of Conforming Clergy, (though you have ſaid, that *many* of them are *pious*, *able*, and *faithfull* in their places yet) you more than ſeem to *load* them, *p.* 74. with the *unchriſtian like* charge of *perjury*, *perfidiouſneſs*, and *perſecution*, *proud*, *contending who ſhall be greateſt*, *and Covenanting*, *never in certain points to obey Chriſt againſt the World and the Fleſh*.

And, you cannot but know, this is no way Argumentative: unleſs you deſign'd to *weaken* the *Affections* of the people towards us, and ſo to prepare them for a ſeperation: which I am not willing to beleive: for that I find, you, in many *other* places, ſo earneſtly perſwading to the *contrary*.

Sir, I do not preſume to adviſe you: but Sir, if you ſhall think to write any more upon this matter, let me beſeech you ſeriouſly to conſider, whether your own *principles*, and the preſent vile *practiſes* of ſeperation, contrary thereunto, would not more worthily and more *ſeaſonably* draw your ſtudies *another* way.

I know, that the peace and reputation, and *Integrity*, of our *Parochial* Churches are dear to you, however you were tempted to *mistake* me, and to let some things fly, some things that may chance to prejudice them more than you would.

There are *two* principles scattered up and down your *Answerer*, that I here mainly aim at, and into *these* indeed, all its strength resolves. 1. That the Non-Conformists *must preach*. 2. That to the end the people may *serve God better*, they may gather themselves into *other* Churches. The *first* of these would not concern me in the *defence* of my *other* Book, neither, doth the allowance of it, draw a *necessity* of gathering Churches, as we have made to appear above the *latter* of them, indeed, lies at the *bottom* of all that you say against me, and *I* have often spoken to it, even, where ever *I* met it *I* am now making my *Petition* in the Churches behalf, that you would lay to heart the *certain Divisions* and confusions that must *needs* follow, upon the *practise* of both these *principles*, *jointly* received, and improved by the skill of *Dividers*, and the cunning craftiness of such as *lie in wait* for that purpose.

The first of these, that they *must preach*, give me leave to say, as it is the present *Engine*

gine for diviſion, is a *plain cheat* put upon the World, and not to be countenanced by an *honeſt* man.

They *muſt preach*, but why? becauſe of the *Text*, becauſe of the *neceſſities* of the people, and laſtly, becauſe of their *Relation* to their *old* Flocks, of each a little.

They muſt preach, becauſe the *Text* ſaith, there is a *neceſſity laid upon us, and woe be to us* if we *do not* preach.

Anſ. But, my *Brethren*, what if you have no *opportunity*, and the Churches are all *full*, *muſt ye preach* ſtill? We have before noted, from Mr. *Baxter*, that *where there is no opportunity there is no duty*, and conſequently, there is no *neceſſity* no *Woe*, & is it not *plain* enough, that while you have no *particular* flock, eſpecially, while the *Law* forbids you to have any, you have no *opportunity* to preach publiquely: can have no opportunity to be ſo *buſie in another mans Dioceſs*: nor warrant in *Conſcience* without leave from the Laws, which are ſtill obliging, notwithſtanding, *&c*, and the *License* of the *Biſhop*, or the *Parochial Miniſter*, *to whoſe people* you would preach.

It ought to be remembred, this Doctrine is perfect *Browniſm*, and condemn'd as *ſuch* by the *Old Non-Conformiſts*, who held and defended againſt the *Browniſts*, that though *themſelves* were only *ſuſpended*, and had yet by Law the *poſſeſſion* of their places and no *other*,

could lay claim to their flocks, yet, being only thus *suspended*, they ought not to preach publiquely to their *own people*.

Whether *suspended* or *degraded*, their Doctrine was not the *necessity* to preach, as you and the *Brownist* say, but to keep *silent*.

For so long said they, as the *Bishops suspend and deprive according to Law*, we *account of the Action herein*, *as of the Act of the Church*, if *they do otherwise* we have *liberty given us*, by *the Law to appeal from them*.

Obj. But we think in our *Consciences* that the causes of *our* Silencing are *not sufficient* to justifie it. *This* very Objection also the *Brownists* used to the *Non-Conformists* of old, and received this Answer from them.

Ans. *It* lies say they, in them to *depose* that may *ordain*, and they may *shut* that may 'open. And that, as he may with a *good Con-* 'science execute a ministry, by the *Ordination* 'and calling of the Church who is privie to 'himself of some *unfitness* (if the Church will press him to it) so may he who is privy to 'himself of *no fault* that deserves *Deprivation*, 'cease from the *execution* of his Ministry, 'when he is pressed thereunto by the Church. 'And indeed, if a *guiltless* person *put out* of 'his charge, by the Churches Authority, may 'yet continue in it, what proceedings can 'there be against *guilty* persons, who in their 'own conceits, are alwaies *guiltless*, or will at least

'leaſt pretend ſo to be; ſeeing they alſo will 'be ready alway to *object* againſt the *Chur-* 'ches *judgment*, that they are called of *God*, 'and may not therefore, give over the exe- 'cution of their Miniſtery at the will of *Man*.

Obj. But how ſhall we anſwer the *Text*, *woe be to us if we do not preach?* Thus alſo the *Brownists* urged againſt the *Non-Conformists*, and were thus *ſolidly* anſwered.

Anſ. The caſe now, and in the *Apoſtles* 'times, is far *different*. *Firſt*, they that *inhi-* 'bited the Apoſtles, were known and profeſ- 'ſed *Enemies* to the Goſpel: *Secondly*, the 'Apoſtles were charged, not to teach in the 'name of *Chriſt*, nor to publiſh any part of 'the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*; which Com- 'mandement, might more hardly be yielded unto, 'than this of our *Biſhops*, who are not only con- 'tent that the *Goſpel* ſhould be preached, but 'are alſo *Preachers* of it *themſelves*. Laſtly, the 'Apoſtles received not their calling & Autho- 'rity *from men*, nor by the hands of men, 'but immediately from *God* himſelf; and 'therefore might not be reſtrain'd or depoſ'd 'by *Men*: whereas, we, though we exerciſe 'a Function whereof *God* is the *Author*, and 'are alſo called of God to it, yet are we cal- 'led and ordained by the hand and Miniſtry 'of *men*, and therefore may by *men* be alſo 'depoſed, and reſtrained from the exerciſe of 'our Miniſtry.

These three last objections and answers are taken out of a Book called a grave and modest confutation of the errors of the Sect called *Brownists* or Seperatists: Agreed upon long since by the joint consent of many Ministers then standing out in the cause of *Non-Conformity* published by Mr. *Rathbang* 1644. *par.* 2. *p.* 41, 42.

2. They *must preach*, because the *people need* it, the necessities of thousands of Souls require it.

Yet *you* ask, „ is *the notorious need of many hundred thousand souls no reason?* —— *is the releiving of many Godly Christians who are cast out of your Communion because they dare not conform*, no reason?

But *I* am still confident you have *no reason*, or no good ones: for, *I* believe you have brought out the *best* you had, to make this vapour, and for the credit of the *Cause*: for neither these, nor their fellows as hath appeared, are worth a fig: and yea, some would tell you they are *rotten*, they have great *Worms* in them; and are only fit to please *Children*.

Doe but open these *reasons*, and you will presently find they are deceitful *wares*, and nothing but *skin*. The sense of them is, Non-Conformists *must preach*, upon a double reason, taken from the *people*. 1. from their *numbers*. 2. From their *quality*.

1. From

1. From their *numbers*. *Many hundred thousand souls*, *Souls*. thousand souls, hundred thousand souls, many hundred thousand souls and *all* these need, *notoriously* need, *Non-conformists* preaching. Here is *strength* of Argument indeed, and is *this no reason*? *I* am sure his *Rhetorick*, as *sweet* to some mens *palates*.

But, *I* marvail at *two* things: *first*, that this *great* necessity should be so *notorious* to *none* but your selves, and that a *Christian Government* should *notoriously* be guilty of the blood of *so many hundred thousand souls*, by suffering them to *perish for lack of knowledge*, had another said it, *I* should have answered, this is a most *notorious slander*.

The *second* thing, *I* wonder at, is, how any *Conscientious* man dare say, contrary to plain *sence* and *Fact*, that *this* is the *Reason necessitating* Non-Conformist. to preach, as they do. Seeing, in the places *worst served*, we so seldome hear of your *new* Congregations. But, as some *Mountebanks* pretend to cure the *head* by applications to the feet, you have skill to work by a quite *contrary* method you will cure the *feet* by tampering with the *head*.

In *plain* English, all this is but a *blind* and a *stawking-Horse*, behind which, these *fowlers* lurck, to catch their *Game*, and to draw our best and *fattest* Partridge into their *Net*:

it is *Cities*, Corporations, and the *Wealthiest* parts of the Kingdome, where they *Tinele* their Bells and draw *Swarms* to their Hives that will yeild most *Honey*,

You seem some where *p.* 74. to tax my *Charity* or *Verity* in an intimation tending *this* way; but my *particular* experience, as well as *general*, and not to be controled, *observation*, was my *Warrant*. *I* will trouble you with a pat Instance of *two* or *three* Non-Conformists in a place where I am *well acquainted*; and I count them not a whit the lesse *honest* for their plain dealing in the point,

One of them, that hath a *Licence* to preach in a *Country* House, near the place where he lives, told me himself, that, unless he should know, what they would *pay* him, he would *not preach* among them: and *I* suppose, they differed upon that point, for he is gon off, and joyned himself with a *Brother* of *another* Church. *Another*, licenced to preach in his own *Parish*, where he rents a *Farm*, told the *Minister* of that Parish, that he would loose 50. pound by his Farm, that he might remove, and place himself in a *Corporation*, that is indeed very well furnisht with *Ministers*, and better without his Company. A *third*, also licenced to preach in his *own House* yet, *one* Lords day in *three*, as I am informed by a pretty good hand, rides *twelve* miles to

exercise

exercise his gifts in a great *Town*, not meanly provided with *publique preachers*. And all these three, within *eight* miles one of another: and these are plain and honest men, and doubtless speak their own and their Brethrens minds, for by this *foot* you may guess at *Hercules*.

I cannot forbear hereupon to commend the *wit* of that excellent man, who said *smartly*, 'and ingenuously some years agon. *I* doubt, they 'see their Condition would be *woful* indeed, 'if they preacht the Gospel there (in the 'Country Cures, that are *worst served*,) and 'therefore they should have added *two* words 'to the Apostles speech and said, Woe be to 'us if we preach not the Gospel in *London*, '(or in *Bristol*, or in *Exon*, or in *Plymouth*, '*Totnes* or *Dartmouth*. There is little to be 'got by preaching it to the *poor Country* folk. 'Those are *barren* places to sow the *seed* in, 'and will bring forth small *profit* to them-'selves, and so they would do well to say, in 'plain English (and *I* should think them ho-'nester men if they did) *Necessity is laid upon us* to tell you the *Truth*, we *must preach*, to *get a living*.

Many such *Tricks* there are, you know, to be done by *Numbers*; but when they are once discovered, they are as *silly* as this.

2. But their *quality* may be *considerable*, that's the *other* reason of *necessity*. For you

Ask,

Ask, is the *relcieving of many Godly Christians, who are cast out of your Communion because they dare not conform*, no Reason?

Sr, will you say in *earnest*, that the Non-Conformist should countenance *such* in their *Seperation*, and *harden* them in their sin? and that a *necessity* lies upon them to do so? though you *your self* believe that these people may not only *lawfully*, but that it is *best* for them to Communicate with the *Parishes*, if their Scruples and *mistakes* were removed?

However, the *Cheat* here, will be too manifest, if we open this one *box*: who are *those* that are thus to be *releived*. You can mean no *other* but such as did not Communicate with us before the Indulgence, for such as *then* did, may do so *still*, and not *need* your *Charity*.

Then, those that are to be Releived, must be either *Independents*, or *Anabaptists*, or *Quakers*, or those, that go under the Name o. *Presbyterians*.

Vid. p. 14. Now, *I* think, you your self would not *head* any of the three *former* of these *Sects*; or if you, or any of your *brethren* would stoop so *low*, how would they in *pride trample* upon you? and in *derision*, tell you, they have *pastors* of their *own* way, and need none of your care or pains.

It follows that the persons *needing* your relief, must be the people known by the name of *Presbyterians*, that did *not* conform before the

the *Toleration*, be it ſo. Were their *Numbers* ſo great to *need* the releif of ſo many *thouſand* Non-Conforming *Miniſters*, as ſome brag of? *I* would not have you *Count* them, leaſt you be *aſhamed* of your Argument.

In this *City*, *I* am credibly informed, there were not above 30 or 40 at moſt of *this quality*, that *ordinarily* refuſed the publique and met privately before the *Indulgence*: and we have, they tell me, *ten Non-Conformiſt* come into their releif. But what needed *Toleration* in this Caſe? *Ten Preachers* to *fourty* Hearers, by an eaſy Diviſion might have kept within the *compaſs* of the *Act*. Now indeed, they have drawn a greater number together, though not of ſuch as *durſt* not come to our Churches, but of ſuch as *did*: but for *whoſe* Releif, the *peoples* or their *own*, ſome do give a ſhrew'd gueſs.

3. The *laſt* Reaſon aſſigned for Non-Conformiſts *preaching*, is not ſo *confidently* delivered, yet ſufficiently intimated: it is founded in the *Relation* betwixt the *Pariſh* and the *Ejected* Miniſter. Yet, methinks, you ſhould conſider the *enmity* to order and *Government* and *Peace*, that *this* reaſon carries in it: and the neceſſity of *Schyſm*, in one or both parties, about their *old* and *new* Paſtor, before you aſſert it any more. God is not the *God of confuſion*, and that which tends to confuſion he will never own.

I have, *before* ſpoken ſufficiently to the unreaſonableneſs of the *principle*, and ſhall *now* only note the *Fraud* of the *perſons*, that uſe it to their *private* ends: which I know you cannot endure, for in truth, 'tis made an *Engine* to *keep up a faction* in the Church, and litt'e elſe is done with it.

If they *muſt preach* becauſe their *Relation* to their flock requires it, why do they not reſort to the *places* from which they were *Ejected*? Or how can this poor *pretence* juſtify their preaching ſo *generally* in *other* places? Sure all that now preach, were not *Paſtors* in the places where they now preach, *heretofore*. Indeed their *Country Pariſhes* muſt now ſhift for them, they are generally called *higher*. Here are *Ten Non-Conformiſts* in this City: but how many of them were Paſtors *here Aug.* 24. 62? About *two* or *three*: and what *Title* they had, they beſt know themſelves. But what pretence have the other ſeaven? and what makes *ſuch* as were ejected in *other* Counties, and out of *Country Pariſhes* to trouble *this* City? I hope none are ſo wiſe as to ſay, that theſe are to fill up the *Dead* places, to *perpetuate the Faction*.

I confeſs ſuppoſing their former places be not *well ſerved*, and the *Ejected* did confine themſelves to *thoſe* places, it ſeems to be the moſt *plauſible* colour that I have yet ſeen, but it is neither *ſo*, nor *ſo*, and I hope you will abhor

abhor the Patronage of such *Impostures*, when you have exercis'd your *seeming* thoughts.

2. Too much of the *necessity* of preaching: but that this may be maintained, you say, they may *gather* new *Churches*: and this must run upon a pretence of *purity*, and *serving God better*, than we do in *ours*, or, as you express it in the place we lately speak of; is the *exercising of a Worship and Discipline more agreeable to Gods word than yours* (*We are you say, p. 30. ready to give you the proof when we have leave*) *in Reason*.

But it seems you *have not* proved it: can you *fairly* leave us and *gather* Churches, out of *ours*, before you have proved it? else, have you done your endeavour, in order to our *Conviction*, and *Reformation*? if not, your *Seperation*. Let the *ground* be what it will, for the *Manner*, it is *Rash* and unwarrantable, and indeed *Schysmatical*, in the judgment of the *best* Casuists, as well *Presbyterians* as others, as hath appeared before.

Yea, it hath appeared also, that *this Anabaptistical*, and Browniſtical *principle* of Seperation, the same, with finding *faults* and *corruptions* in our Churches, and the pretences of *Reformation* for *purer* Churches, and serving God in more *purity*, as they used to Cant: and that it hath no *bounds*, but naturally divides *Sect out of Sect* till it brings us to utter *Confusion*.

And

And you have a hard *task* upon your hands to perſwade the people to Communicate *with us* as their *Duty*, and yet to allow gathering Churches from us for *purer* worſhip and diſcipline, upon this principle, that we are bound to ſerve *God* in the *beſt* way we can, and conſequently, we are bound either not to ſerve him in a *worſe* way, or elſe, we are to ſerve God in *both Communions*, and to be members of *two* particular *Churches* at once, of *different* Worſhip, Government, and Diſcipline.

Rather, throw it away as an *unpeaceable* and *ungovernable* principle: and do like *your ſelf*, to undergirt and ſupport the ſorely threatned, and even *ſincking* Parochial *Conſtitution* of our Churches: ſay what you will to the *Contrary*, if you take not in this miſchievous *Engine*, you plainly *Countenance* all the *Factions* in the Kingdome to endeavour the *Ruine* and ſubverſion of *them*.

While we keep within the *ancient* bounds and conſtitutions, we know *where* we are: but if one we begin to *Tumble*, where we ſhall *Stop*, God only knowes. I need not mind you of the fearful *end* of *Gnoſtiſcime*, *Donatiſm*, *Brownſm*, and of our late Seperations, which took their beginning in *Independency*: they all had pretences to break the *Peace*, under Colours of *purity*, but in the *ſhuffle*, they loſt *both*, and *ſunck* down at laſt, into the Sinck of *Confuſion* and *Impurity*.

Mr.

Epist. to his rest Print. 1669. Mr. *Baxter*, will not suffer us to forget something to this purpose from our *late* experience: which methinks, should keep us *awake* 'do not your *hearts bleed* (saith he) to look 'upon the State of *England*, and to think 'how few *Towns* and *Cities*, there be, where 'is any *forwardness* in *Religion*) that are not 'cut into shreds and crumbled as to *Dust*, by 'Seperations and Divisions? to think what 'a *Wound* we have thereby given to the *Chri-'stian name*?

These consequences, Mr. *Calvin* reckons to be just *judgments* of God necessarily following the *dissolution* of the sacred Bond of Unity which the *God of peace* and the *Father* of *mercy*, avert from this *divided* and untoward generation.

God, who dost teach the hearts of thy faithful people, by sending to them the light of thy holy spirit, grant us by the same spirit, to have a right judgment in all things: and evermore to rejoyce in his holy Comfort, through the *Merits* of *Christ Jesus* our Saviour.

Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that the course of this World may be so ordered by thy Governance, that thy Church may joyfully serve thee in all Godly quietness, through *Jesus Christ* our Lord. *Amen.*

FINIS.